CENTRAL BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
0 0021 0031675 7

Central BAPTIST
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

FK50
B131

0 0021 0031675 7

STUDIES IN MATTHEW

STUDIES IN MATTHEW

BY

BENJAMIN W. BACON, D.D., Litt.D. (Oxon.)

BUCKINGHAM PROFESSOR (EMERITUS) OF NEW TESTAMENT CRITICISM
AND EXEGESIS IN YALE UNIVERSITY

N.T. Matthew
16556.

NEW YORK
HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY
1930

LIBRARY
CENTRAL BAPTIST SEMINARY
KANSAS CITY 2, KANSAS

COPYRIGHT, 1930

BY

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY, INC.

PRINTED IN THE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

226.2011
B 128

Dedicated to

THE OXFORD SOCIETY OF HISTORICAL THEOLOGY

in grateful remembrance of the distinction
of Honorary Membership conferred on
the author in 1920.

16556

PREFACE

THE present work may be taken as a substitute for Vol. II of the series of "Modern" commentaries on the Gospels projected more than twenty years ago. Vol. I appeared from the Yale University Press in 1909 under the title *Beginnings of Gospel Story: A Historico-critical Enquiry into the Sources and Structure of Mk.* Vol. II, entitled *The Book of the Precepts of Jesus*, a commentary on Mt prepared on the same plan as its predecessor on Mk, after completion in manuscript in 1917 was withdrawn from the Press because of complications arising from the greatly increased cost of printing. When circumstances again made publication feasible, lapse of time had made mere revision insufficient. The decision was taken to abandon the more costly form and embody the main conclusions in a series of "Studies" permitting a combination of various types of observations on the Gospel, notes introductory, exegetical, and biblico-theological.

Gospel criticism should logically issue in what is called for lack of better designation a Life of Christ. Real biography is of course out of the question where contemporary records do not exist and the career described covers little more than a single year. Nevertheless the title has been applied for a century and a half to works whose purpose was to inform the public of the results of historical study of the four Gospels and may serve broadly to define the ultimate aim of the present writer.

For such a work three principal lines of enquiry are dictated by the nature of the sources. Indeed these themselves give evidence of the hunger of Christians of the earliest generations to know: (1) The story of Jesus' career as prophet and messianic leader up to his tragic fate in Jerusalem; (2) the nature and content of his message; (3) the permanent significance of his personality and work for the history and practice of religion.

The first of these lines of enquiry leads us directly to the earliest extant gospel, hereinafter designated Mk because of its traditional ascription to John, surnamed Mark,[1] an associate of the Apostle

[1] In the present volume the abbreviations Mt, Mk, Lk, Jn, are used to designate the canonical Gospels and their compilers, without reference to the correctness or incorrectness of the tradition which declares them to be "according to" the Apostles Matthew and John, and the "companions of apostles" Mark and Luke; also without reference to the sense in which "according to" should be taken. When mention is made of the individuals "Mark," "Matthew," etc.,

Peter, who is said to have gathered and translated surviving material from Peter's accounts of the sayings and doings of the Lord.

The second conducts to a record of the teaching of Jesus no longer extant save as it may be reconstructed from extracts made by the canonical evangelists. Mt and Lk contain considerable sections not found in Mk which cannot have been derived by either from the other, but coincide even more closely in language than the sections which they independently derive from Mk. This "double-tradition" material, as it is still often called, has come to be known as Q (from the German *Quelle*=Source), although it is not itself the source, but only the most easily traceable factor of a lost work which we shall designate S, drawn upon independently by Mt and Lk to supplement Mk's deficiencies of teaching material. S cannot, of course, be fully reconstructed from Q alone, though the Q material shows enough of inner consistency to prove it derived by Mt and Lk from a single Greek document. Nevertheless with Q as a nucleus, carefully restricted use of two other available factors may enable us to form a fairly adequate idea of the nature and contents of S.

The more important of these two additional factors for the reconstruction of S is the "single-tradition" material of Mt and Lk, that is, material found in Mt only or Lk only. This material peculiar to Mt or Lk will be designated P, or, if need arise to distinguish that of Lk from that of Mt, P^{mt} and P^{lk}. Elements of P, both Matthean and Lukan, give evidence of derivation from the same document as Q. Parts of P are therefore included by many critics in their reconstructions of S, though too often the same designation Q is employed both for factors included under the definition and factors conjecturally added.

The other factor available for quarrying possible blocks of S is "triple-tradition" material, that is, elements which have passed from Mk into both Mt and Lk. For Mk may have also drawn from S, though for their narrative element Mt and Lk have usually preferred the source which in tradition bore the authority of Peter's name. "Triple-tradition" material already has the designation Mk. It needs, therefore, no separate symbol for parts ascribed to S.

The distinction between Q and S is obviously important. To speak of the "double-tradition" material Q as if this factor alone could give us the lost source is misleading. The introduction of larger or smaller amounts of P or Mk material without separate designation is no less so. Worst of all is that prejudgment of the nature and contents of S, a source totally unknown before the nineteenth century, involved in

the names will be printed in full. In quoted passages the abbreviations will be used, but with the endeavor in all cases to conserve the exact meaning of the author quoted.

references to it as "the Logia," or even "the Logia spoken of by Papias." [2] The symbols above proposed are intended to do away with such question-begging, ambiguous, and misleading terms. Q will here be used only of "double-tradition" material in strict accord with its usual definition: "coincident material of Mt and Lk not found in Mk." If Mk or P material is connected with Q in the attempt to form a true conception of the lost S it will come in under its own proper designation and for reasons stated. The nature and content of S will not be prejudged by any attempt to apply to it terms which in their original employment were meant to apply to another writing. Let it be repeated. In the present work the two main synoptic *sources* are designated Mk and S; the three *classes of material* encountered are designated P, Q, and R.

The third line of enquiry leads to a different goal by a different approach. The fourth Gospel was ascribed by second-century fathers to the Apostle John, whom they surnamed the "theologian" from the opening words of its Preamble. Only in this late product of the Hellenistic Church has the ultimate question of religious values been placed in the foreground. True, the earlier three gospels, called Synoptic from their dependence on a common outline, are also concerned to prove the authority of Jesus as a divine Redeemer; but they resort for proof to the apostolic record of the sayings and doings of the Lord. To this extent their motive is historical. Jn, contrariwise, subordinates history to doctrine. His version of the sayings and doings is a selected group of wondrous "signs" from the flood of less responsible report, for each of which he composes an appropriate doctrinal discourse, the whole work expounding the theory of a divine incarnation: Jesus a manifestation of the eternal redemptive Spirit of God.

The present writer has given his critical valuation and interpretation of the Petrine-Markan record of the public ministry of Jesus in three volumes antecedent to this. In *Beginnings of Gospel Story* (Yale Press, 1909), *Is Mk a Roman Gospel?* (Harvard University Studies VII, 1919), and *The Gospel of Mk: its Sources, Structure and Date* (Yale Press, 1926), a foundation has been laid.

As respects the teaching of Jesus also a beginning was made by the little volume entitled *The Sermon on the Mount* (Macmillan, 1902), now left far behind by Marriott's work of the same title (1925).

The third line of approach is represented in a full treatment of the history of the fourth Gospel from compilation to canonization under the title *The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate* (Yale Press, 1910),

[2] See the protest of J. A. Robinson, *Study of the Gospels*, 1919, p. 69, and compare Appended Notes I and II on "The Date of Papias" and "The Meaning of the Term λόγια."

though with too little attention to the historical valuation and interpretation of the Hellenistic form of the redemptive message.

All these publications, with others similar, have their place in preparing for a comprehensive Life of Christ; for all three forms of the tradition have contributed, each in its own way, to the development of the faith. Those in most frequent use will be referred to in the present volume under suitable abbreviations.[3]

But all the present writer's contributions taken together fall short of constituting a proportioned series of preliminary studies. The series on Mk comes nearest to completeness, and has been summarized in the little volume *The Story of Jesus: a Valuation of the Synoptic Record for History and Religion* (Century Co., 1926). But this, as the subtitle makes clear, tells the story of the story. It is only an approach to the story of Jesus. As respects the Lukan writings reference can be made to the article "Le témoignage de Luc sur lui-même" in *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses*, VIII, 3 (Mai-Juin, 1928), together with some others on Acts; but proportionate preliminary study looking to a Life of Christ would demand a volume on the Second Synoptic Source based on critical comparison of the teaching material of Mt and Lk. Its fruit might be an appreciation of the inner life of Jesus not unlike that of W. E. Bundy called *The Religion of Jesus* (1928). This might serve to bring into truer perspective the Lukan depiction of the great Teacher, far superior to the Matthean as it is, both historically and for sympathetic appreciation. But time and strength can hardly be expected for this task. A more indispensable preliminary is a rounding out of the work already done on the fourth Gospel, to demonstrate its contribution to the ultimate theme: The personality and work of Jesus in bridging the chasm between God and man. Were it possible to fill out these unfinished bits of construction one might feel better prepared to re-narrate the work and martyrdom of Jesus, suiting the story to an age as insistent upon historico-critical enquiry as determined upon religious revaluation.

Life is too short for preparation on such a scale. Such brief working time as still remains must be given to the two volumes most indispensable to the scheme of approach: (1) The present *Studies in Mt*, which aim to clear the way for such appreciation of the great religious Teacher as can only be gained by placing the witness of Mt in right relation to the richer resources and more sympathetic touch of Lk; (2) A historico-critical analysis and interpretation of the fourth Gospel, to be expected in 1930 under the title *The Gospel of the Hellenists*. This study of Jn will aim to show its true place in the development of the religion *about* Jesus.

[3] See table, p. xxv.

For Christianity, as it issues from the maelstrom of oriental religions of personal immortality which contended for the adhesion of the Graeco-Roman world, is a blend of Jewish messianist apocalypse with Hellenistic doctrines of redemption by incarnation of a divine Messenger. In *The Gospel of the Hellenists* the present writer hopes to make up that which was lacking in *The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate.* Thereafter, if time and strength are still available, the larger task may be undertaken of bringing into convergence the three specified lines of approach. Studies preparatory to a Life of Christ interpreting Jesus' brief career as Prophet and Healer, as messianic Teacher, Leader, and Martyr, as glorified Son of Man, as redemptive incarnation of the Spirit of God and eternal Lord, may well demand years of research. If after all the culminating task should be bequeathed unfinished to other hands, the preparation will not be regretted. Labor thus spent is its own richest reward.

But the occasion for Studies in Mt is made urgent by two widespread and harmful preconceptions. Both are ultimately due to illusions of scholars, but one has behind it the accumulated inertia of fifteen centuries of unquestioning acceptance, the other of scarcely one. The popular illusion of apostolic authorship, if not for the canonical first Gospel itself, at least for some Aramaic Mt of which the Greek writing might be taken as a translation, has dominated the Church's belief for so long that even a unanimous verdict against it from all modern scholarship affects but few. Mt is still used and quoted by clergy and laity alike just as if it were a primary, or even an apostolic source, though known and (tacitly) acknowledged to be secondary. Mt continues today as in the second century to be the preferred source for all gospel quotations, even when the same passage is found in Mk or Lk in more original and authentic form. The effect as regards the particular passage may be of small moment, but the general result of this indolent acquiescence in a secondary, altered report when more reliable, unaltered witness is available, is deplorable. It commits to the public as the standard record of the life and teaching of Jesus a report which is known to be inferior, a form adapted to the special beliefs and needs of later times. This is a substitution which could not occur outside a Church which has inherited something of the disposition of the scribes rebuked by Jesus for making the Scripture of none effect that they might keep their own tradition.

The second prepossession which the present writer would do his part to dispel is more recent. It is an illusion of scholars which stands in the way of effective research for the most authentic record of the teaching of Jesus. We may call it the fallacy of the "Matthean Logia." It had its origin less than a century ago in the theory of

Schleiermacher which applied to Q the statement of Papias in which he referred to our own first canonical Gospel as a compilation (σύνταξις) of the precepts of Jesus (τὰ λόγια) to the exposition of which his own work (*c.* 140) [4] was dedicated. The Gospel, then as now, was in Greek and of course bore, as now, the title "According to Matthew." Papias met the objection that the Apostle's language was "Hebrew" (that is, Aramaic) by affirming that the Gospel had originally been written in "Hebrew" but had been translated by some unknown Greek Christian. For, as he added, the custom had formerly been to give renderings of the precepts (not the Gospel) as they had been orally transmitted in the language of Jesus.

All scholars now admit the impossibility of Papias' having reference to, or direct knowledge of, any other Mt than our own. Some followers of Schleiermacher's view took refuge in the supposition that "the Elder," from whom Papias derived the tradition, might have meant a Proto-Mt, equivalent to Q, and been misunderstood by Papias. The answer that Papias does not profess to derive his statement regarding Mt from the Elder, and could not well have had it on this authority, had small effect. The notion still prevails that the second century preserved somehow, somewhere, the remembrance of a Proto-Mt having certain characteristics other than mere language to distinguish it from our own. This illusion, like Jerome's theory of similar origin in the fourth century of the "authentic Hebrew," began as a bit of scholastic theorizing, but has not yet released its hold. On the contrary, persisted in by many critics, it already percolates downward till numbers of intelligent readers begin to talk of Q as a recovered document and to apply to it the names "The Logia," "The Matthean Logia," and even "The Logia spoken of by Papias."

Q is not an illusion but a real discovery, and vitally important. But Q is not S. Q does represent a factor of common material by which Mt and Lk have independently supplemented the deficiencies of Mk on the side of teaching. It would be of much greater value to gospel critics and students of the Life of Christ if freed from the preconceptions of scholars eager to find ancient testimony to support their views. Unfortunately the temptation has proved in many cases too great. Papias was put upon the rack and a meaning he would not admit has been forced from his words. In reality nothing whatever is known of the authorship, character, or contents of S beyond what critics may derive, directly or indirectly, from Q. Reconstruction has now come to a temporary halt. Its results thus far are rightly characterized as "a heap of interesting ruins." What might have been known of S if the protests of Hilgenfeld, Zahn, Wernle, Loisy, and

[4] See Appended Note I, "The Date of Papias."

others against the perversion of Papias had not fallen on deaf ears only the future can tell. When gospel criticism is no longer dominated by the ghost of Schleiermacher's dead theory it may be able to resume its progress toward the better understanding of the teaching of Jesus.

The present volume has therefore a two-fold purpose. It appeals to intelligent students of the Gospels, who if aware of the unanimous verdict of scholarship for the priority of Mk and S have not adjusted their practice to it. The verdict may justly be called unanimous, for even Zahn, greatest of the few surviving champions of the ancient doctrine of the priority of Mt, holds to it only in the roundabout form proposed by Grotius: a *lost* Hebrew Mt the common source of our Synoptic Gospels, the canonical Mt standing to this X in the relation of a translation whose language has been assimilated to Mk. This *lost* Mt naturally has all the qualities which pertained to the Princetonian *lost* inerrant Bible. It may not help the public, but it saves the face of mistaken apologists.

A forced and belated admission is perhaps all that should be expected when cherished illusions are dispelled. Yet the writer pleads for more. Tacit and reluctant assent has little beyond a negative value. It leaves new truth still an alien substance, an irritating foreign body, encysted only because it could not be extruded. New light can break forth with difficulty from the Scriptures to minds thus disposed. The present volume is addressed to readers of greater faith. To them it offers opportunity for more careful study of that process of recasting which the gospel record has undergone, with the aim of distinguishing the primary testimony from later adaptation. Not that either should be disparaged, but each lend its own aid to reverent research. For appreciation of Mk and S as prior witnesses to the public career and teaching of Jesus should not make valueless the added witness of later adaptations which adjusted the story to the needs and beliefs of a post-apostolic age, an age deserving of our study, rewarding to investigation by every resource at our command.

A further purpose concerns the scholar's quest for sources. Again a double objective is in view. Study of method, means, and purpose of the redactor has a certain value for its reflection of his own age and environment, but its chief value is for the removal of obstacles to further research. Studies in Mt should tend to renew discouraged effort in the quest of Q. The P element in Mt as in Lk must be sifted for material of various value. In addition to editorial material (R), recognizable both from function and from well ascertained peculiarities of style and language, there are almost certainly considerable blocks of S which Lk failed to incorporate. Besides this we must allow for elements taken up from current oral tradition (O), and for a cer-

tain element which is responsible for much of the debate about Mt since Jerome's time, and which might be derived either from oral or from written sources. It is an element very small in compass but highly distinctive in character. We shall give to it provisionally the designation N in the belief that its derivation, whether in oral or written form, is from that body of Nazarene Christians represented in the period of Apollinaris of Laodicea, Jerome, and Epiphanius by an Aramaic-speaking church in Beroea-Aleppo. Fragments transcribed by Jerome of a later *Gospel of the Nazarenes* are still extant, together with other readings in certain Mss. by scribes influenced by Jerome's theory under the marginal note "the Jewish" (τὸ Ἰουδαικόν).[5] Our working hypothesis will be that just as these Mss. show contamination from the Aramaic source in the period after Jerome, so in the period before the final redaction of Mt a precanonical form of Aramaic gospel circulating in the same region had affected it by similar contamination. The theory must be tested in our introductory discussions. The designation N calls for explanation at this point.

The question of sources we confess to be our deepest interest in these Studies in Mt. For real advance toward the authentic teaching of Jesus it would be desirable, if time and strength allowed, to prepare such a volume on the basis of critical comparison of Mt and Lk as above proposed, this to be followed by a second volume applying to the resultant S the most approved methods of historical interpretation. The whole might then be summed up in a survey of the teaching of Jesus on the plan of our "biblical theologies."

A more practicable course is suggested by the structure of Mt itself, a course which limits attention for the present to this Gospel only. A half-century ago it was recognized that its compiler has followed the plan of aggregating his teaching material from all sources into five great discourses corresponding to the oration codes of the Pentateuch, each introduced, like the Mosaic codes, by a narrative section, each closing with a transition formula as the reader passes from discourse to narrative. To these five bodies of discourse Sir John Hawkins[6] would apply the Hebrew term *pereq*, meaning "chapter" or "section." The lay reader will find it easier to think of them as "Sermons" in view of the first of the series, a discourse on the Righteousness of Sons, to which custom has applied the title "Sermon on the Mount." Prefixed to the first narrative section we find two loosely connected chapters relating the birth and infancy of Jesus from sources elsewhere unknown. This section, Mt 1–2, may most conveniently be designated the Preamble. Correspondingly after the last of the five discourses the transition formula leads over to three chapters (26–28)

[5] See Appended Note VI, "Jewish-Christian Gospels in Relation to Mt."
[6] *H. S.*, pp. 163 f.

of closing narrative relating the passion and resurrection. This *envoi* we may call the Epilogue.

The five-fold division of Mt is no recent discovery, as we shall see. At first, after its recognition by critics, there was a disposition to regard it as a survival from some earlier composition. The five discourses were regarded by the veteran Godet as representing the Proto-Mt supposed to have been attested by Papias. In his *Introduction to the New Testament* (Vol. II, "Gospel Collection and St. Matthew," Engl. transl. 1899, p. 182) Godet describes them and their method of composition.

> They have, he says, a historical basis, forming the beginning of the discourse and connected with a well defined situation, a situation signalized in the same way in Mk and Lk; then the addition to this primitive nucleus of other materials, heterogeneous as regards the situation, but homogeneous as regards the matter.

Godet further points out the "nearly identical formula of transition" whereby after each of the five at 7:28, 11:1, 13:53, 19:1, and 26:1 Mt resumes the thread of his story. He further quotes with deserved approval the five titles previously proposed by Réville: (1) Περὶ τῆς δικαιοσύνης, or Concerning Righteousness; (2) Περὶ τῆς ἀποστολῆς, or Concerning the Apostolate; (3) Περὶ τῆς βασιλείας, or Concerning the Kingdom; (4) Περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, or Concerning the Church; (5) Περὶ τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος, or Concerning the Consummation of the World.

Godet's idea of "the method of composition" of the discourses really fits only the first, the so-called Sermon on the Mount, which contains no Markan material, but is made up as described from several SQ discourses. It has since been abundantly proved that the other four rest on a Markan nucleus. In the words of Streeter,[7] "an analysis of every one of the Great Discourses yields evidence that it is an agglomeration put together by the editor of the Gospel."

But the insight thus slowly gained into the structure of Mt, disappointing as it may be to those who hoped to obtain from it "the Logia spoken of by Papias," is nevertheless a discovery of great value, a discovery which may even find corroboration from antiquity. A Greek fragment first published in 1917 is fully described by Dr. Rendel Harris in Part II of his *Testimonies* (1920, pp. 90–94, 109–136), and applied in support of his theory that the Logia of Papias was a collection of messianic prophecies for the use of Christian apologists. The fragment consists of six iambic verses apparently designed as a prologue to Mt after the plan of the so-called Monarchian Prologues, or the iambic verses quoted by Irenaeus from "a certain elder" (Melito?) who had thus defended "both testaments" against the

[7] *Four Gospels*, 1925, pp. 261–265.

assaults of Marcion and Gnostic heretics. It describes "Matthew" as writing against the Jews, from whose "deicide" strife all the heresies are derived.[8]

To moderns, unacquainted with second-century polemics against the Jewish sects as authors of all heresy, it may seem strange to refer to Mt as written to "curb the rash error of the Jews." To Zahn, a scholar well qualified to define the outstanding characteristics of the Gospel, its "sharp attack upon Judaism as governed and misled by Sadducaic high priests and Pharisaic rabbis" is so prominent a feature of Mt as to lead him to the following italicized definition of the work: "*an historical apology of the Nazarene and His Church over against Judaism.*"[9] There seems to be, therefore, no obstacle to regarding the verses as coming from the age of the apologists, particularly those who defended both Old and New Testament scripture against the assaults of Marcion. But whatever the authorship or date of the *argumentum* its immediate interest for us lies in its description of the "bridle" placed by "Matthew" on Jewish-born heresy as a work in "five discourses" (πέντε λόγοις).

With or without corroboration from ancient sources the discovery of the "five discourses" or "Books" of Mt marks an epoch in the critical understanding and valuation of the work. It should be made correspondingly prominent in attempts such as the present Studies to give the Gospel its historical position and value. Several important commentaries have appeared since that of Allen in the *ICC* series, of which we need mention here only those of Plummer (1910) and McNeile (1915). All of these take proper account of the structural feature of Mt which we have described. Needless to say, critical analyses and introductions use it as fundamental. But something more appears to be needed to convey to the public a realization that Mt is a compilation of gospel teaching in five "books" from material furnished mainly by Mk and S.

[8] The verses in question are given in a revised text by R. Harris in *Testimonies*, Part II (1920), p. 110 as follows:

Ματθαῖος εἴργει τῶν Ἰουδαίων θράσος·
Ὥσπερ χαλινοῖς πέντε φίμωσας λόγοις·
Ὅστις δὲ τούτων τὴν ἐπίρρητον πλάνην
Πλάνην ἀτέχνως (ἐξ)ελέγξει τῷ λόγῳ
Ἄρδην ἀπάσας συγκαθεῖλεν αἱρέσεις·
Μήτηρ γὰρ αὐτῶν ἡ θεοκτόνων ἔρις.

For transmission of text and critical discussion the reader is referred to Dr. Harris. The present writer adheres to the view expressed in his article, "The Five Books of Matthew against the Jews" in *The Expositor* for Jan., 1918 (VIII, 85). On Melito and his *Key to the Scriptures*, see Euseb. *H. E.* IV, 26. The epithet "deicide" (θεόκτονος) occurs in its earliest known use in a fragment of Melito.

[9] *N. T. Introd.*, Engl., 1917, sec. 55, p. 560.

The arrangement of our Studies in Mt aims to meet this lack. To show the real structure of the work it will be divided into its seven parts: Preamble (chh. 1–2); Book I, subdivided into a Narrative **A**, introducing a Discourse **B** (chh. 3–4 and 5–7); Book II, similarly subdivided (**A**, chh. 8–9, **B**, ch. 10); Book III (**A**, chh. 11–12, **B**, ch. 13); Book IV (**A**, chh. 14–17, **B**, ch. 18); Book V (**A**, chh. 19–22, **B**, chh. 23–25); Epilogue (chh. 26–28).

With this subdivision, designed to reflect the evangelist's structural plan, it will be convenient to employ a method of study which lays principal stress upon "introduction" as the most fruitful of modern lines of approach, but allows some room for others also. The line of exegesis will be represented by a new translation supplemented by marginal symbols and by spacing to differentiate sources from redaction. "Biblical" theology will be represented by discussions of the teaching of Jesus on the five themes presented by the evangelist in his agglutinated discourses. To these will be brought the light of the evangelist's tendencies as previously ascertained, as an aid to understanding the actual teaching of Jesus.

For the details of this plan we refer the reader to our Table of Contents as a desirable help in judging to what extent our aim has been achieved, the aim of winning from Studies in Mt a closer approximation toward a truly historical and adequate Life of Christ.

"Destructive criticism" is the unflattering term which men often apply to the effort to break away incrustations of traditional belief from the heroic figure of Jesus. But if the process be attended with some measure of historical knowledge and some sympathetic appreciation for the successive developments of religious faith it cannot fail to open some new vistas through the overgrowth of the centuries past. New light on that central figure is the tribute we desire to pay on this nineteen-hundredth return of "the acceptable year of the Lord."

B. W. B.

New Haven, January, 1930.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS xxv

PART I. GENERAL INTRODUCTION

A. EXTERNAL EVIDENCE

CHAPTER I. THE TRADITION OF MATTHEAN ORIGIN . . 3

Papias our earliest record. His motive, environment, and meaning. Misapprehensions. The tradition contradicted by the internal evidence. Establishment of the doctrine of the Priority of Mk an accepted outcome of a century's study of the Synoptic Problem. Modern opinion on the relation of Mt to Mk. Theory of the survival of a primitive Mt criticized. "Targums" of the canonical Gospels in the second century. Their oral predecessors in relation to Mk and S. The provenance of Mt.

CHAPTER II. THE ROOT OF THE TRADITION 24

Illusions too must be accounted for. Zahn vs. the doctrine of a proto-Mt attested by "the Elder." The question depends on indirect evidence from unacknowledged employments of Mt before the time of Papias. The title "According to Mt"; whence originated and in what sense. Ignatius and the *Didaché*. The indirect external evidence looks to Antioch as the source of the title, but to regions beyond for the origin of the Gospel itself.

CHAPTER III. ASCRIPTION TO "MATTHEW" AND EARLY DISSEMINATION 37

S when current, was not ascribed to the Apostle. The change from "Levi" to "Matthew" in Mt 9:9. Is it a "conceivable" basis of ancient conjecture? Possible alternatives. Consequences of the ascription. Supposed apostolic origin as a factor in the dissemination of Mt.

CHAPTER IV. STEPS TOWARD CANONIZATION 50

Alleged council *de recipiendis libris* at Rome in 120. Possible source of the Syriac synchronisms. The controversy in Phrygia in 167 over the discrepancy between "Matthew" and Jn concerning the date of Easter. The evidences of conflict between Mt and gospels locally current in Phrygia and Italy as related to the question of dissemination and canonization.

B. INTERNAL EVIDENCE

CHAPTER V. (1) INFERENCE FROM SOURCES TO DATE . . 63

Dependence on Mk implies a date "after the death of Peter and Paul." Adaptation of the S parable of the Slighted Invitation to fate of Jerusalem, and of Mk 13 to a date after the Great Apostacy. Nearly contemporary with Lk. Possible indirect relations speak for post-Lukan origin. Relation to rabbinic Judaism of Johanan b. Zacchai and the Tannaim. Affinity

with Christian writings of 90–100. Mk, Hb., and I Pt. reflect the age of persecution, Satan a roaring lion. Mt, Jas., Jude, Rev. 1–3, I and II Tim., Ti. reflect the age of moral lassitude and error. Satan a seducing serpent.

CHAPTER VI. (2) STRUCTURE. USE OF MK 80
The five "Books" of Mt constructed by expansion of Mk, the supplements being mainly from S. The narrative section (A) in all save Book III mainly drawn from Mk, the discourse section (B) in all save Book I having also a Mk basis. Rearrangement, alteration, and supplementation of Mk. Comparison of Mt's motives and method with contemporary rabbinic "teachers" (Tannaim) and the later *Gospel of the Nazarenes.*

CHAPTER VII. THE EXTENT OF Q 91
Reconstruction of S from Q often vitiated by preconception. Hawkins' measurement of agreement criticized. Q material classed as doubtful. Limitation of Q, R, and O elements. Verbal similarity apart from study of R an insufficient basis of judgment. Mt's arrangement of material catechetic, Lk's biographic. Results of criticism of method for determining Mt's Q content.

CHAPTER VIII. MATTHEAN OMISSIONS 105
Limitation of subject. Method of R^{mt} compared to R^{lk}. Mt's omissions partly deliberate partly involuntary. The Lukan L source unknown to Mt. Expansion of S in two directions, biographic (L and Lk) and gnomic (Mt). Character and motive of L. Development of the parable in L. Overlapping of S and L. If Lk uses both we have less ground for assuming a hypothetical M source. Why Mt fails to reflect material of the L type. Why so little trace of S in his Passion story. Endings of S and Mk.

CHAPTER IX. MT'S 'SINGLE-TRADITION' (P) MATERIAL . 120
Four classes of P material. Their relative value for the biographer and for the critic. Parables of Hid Treasure and Costly Pearl assigned to S on inadequate grounds. Analysis of Mt 6:1–18 and 11:28–30. Use of Ecclus. by R^{mt}. Hawkins on elements from S in P^{mt}. Parable types in Mt, Lk, and S. Dissatisfied Wage-earners the only parable of P^{mt} likely to have been drawn from S. Estimate of alleged grounds for a source M. Freedom of R^{mt} in his use of parable. His use of N.

CHAPTER X. TRAITS OF THE REDACTOR 131
R a "converted rabbi." His aim and method. General characteristics of style agree with special peculiarities of diction. Stereotyping of phrases. Favorite expressions. Mt's command of Greek. Use of LXX in Scripture quotations compared with S and N. Criticism of Hawkins' data of characteristics of phrases and locutions. Inferences of Hawkins and von Dobschütz. An example in application.

PART II. SPECIAL INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER XI. THE PREAMBLE. N AND R 145
1. Recession of the Epiphany gospel. "Manifestation of the Son of God" in Paul, Acts, Mk 9, Q, and Mt–Lk. Motive of the prefixed section. Growing Hellenistic influence from Mk to Jn. Magi and Star in Mt vs. Shepherds in Lk. Mesopotamian influences in Mt. 2. N vs. R. Criticism of Soltau's theory. The N element not a gospel. Its unity depends on

attachment to a Petrine stem, but of type differing from L. Comparison with *Ev. Naz.*

CHAPTER XII. THE FIRST BOOK OF MT 165

Theme of the "book." Structure of Division A. Placing of Mt's Discourse in Mk's story. Mk has made additions to primitive outline. His omissions. Mt's use of Mk 1–3. He shortens narrative, expands teaching element from Q. His apologetic supplements. Their affinity with *Ev. Naz.* Division B. Various types of material. P^{mt} compared with Lk. The "New Torah" discourse distinguished from that on Filial Righteousness. An M source uncalled for. Other displacements by R of Q material. Polemic against False Prophets. Close of the Sermon.

CHAPTER XIII. THE SECOND BOOK OF MT 187

Its structure adapted to the Discourse. A Gospeller's *Vade Mecum.* Division A. Ten Mighty Works of Jesus not related as such but as examples for the encouragement and instruction of missioners. Three groups and their several motives. Division B. Its materials and structure. The Mission in Galilee 9:35–10:15. Mt's supplements: (1) Warning of Persecution, (2) Encouragement to Fearless Martyrdom. Composite close. Adaptation of Book II to Church use.

CHAPTER XIV. THE THIRD BOOK OF MT 202

Purpose and structure of the Book. Its theme taken from Mk 3:20–4:34. Formation of the Spiritual Israel. Division A. Relation of Mk to Q reversed. Content of the sources compels this. Both deal with the theme of Rom. 9–11; I Cor. 1:18–2:16, the Hiding of the Mystery from the spiritually blind and deaf; its revelation to babes. Nature and placing of Q material. Division B. Mt's expansion of Mk's Parables of the Kingdom.

CHAPTER XV. THE FOURTH BOOK OF MT 218

Mt 14–28 follows Mk *seriatim.* Slight use of Q accounted for. Mt (against Lk) adopts both motive and material of Mk following Mk's device of an Exilic and a Peraean ministry. Mt's modifications and ("Petrine") supplements. Nazarene (?) solutions of the problems of church unity discussed in Acts. Division B expands the Markan discourse on church administration. The complementary themes of unsparing devotion and mutual toleration. Pauline application of the principles of Jesus in the later period.

CHAPTER XVI. THE FIFTH BOOK OF MT 236

Division A again based on Mk. Traces of Q. Possible connection of S. The Jerusalem section. Two paragraphs show relation to S. Division B has for its nucleus the Doom chapter of Mk. L and Mk vs. Lk on the setting in S. The Woes on Scribes and Pharisees lead over to Warnings of Jerusalem's fate. Mt's two expansions (1) the Seven Woes, (2) the Exhortations to Watchfulness. Mt's motives and resources.

CHAPTER XVII. THE EPILOGUE 250

A transcript of Mk's story of Passion and Resurrection with supplements. Traditions of Lukan and Jerusalem type excluded. Why this restriction? The apostolic Resurrection gospel of I Cor. 15:1–11. Its two groups and two-fold scene. Primitive controversy and the disruption of Mk's ending. Comparison of Mt 26–28 with L, *Ev. Petr.*, and *Ev. Hebr.* Mt's "improvements" on Mk 14–16 and N supplements. Growth of the tradition since Mk. The "treasure" and the "earthen vessel."

PART III. TRANSLATION

I. The Preamble. Chh.1 f. 264
The Genealogy and Virgin Birth, Ch. 1. Epiphany to Astrologers and Rescue from Herod. Settlement in Nazareth, Ch. 2.

II. Book First. Discipleship 269
Division A. Introductory Narrative. Chh. 3–4.
John baptizes the people. Baptism, Vocation, and Testing of Jesus. He begins his work in darkest Galilee, calling four disciples.
Division B. The Discourse. Chh. 5–7.
Jesus blesses and charges his followers. The new Torah. Inward righteousness. Filial worship. Treasure in heaven. Self-judgment. False and true teaching. Rock-foundation.

III. Book Second. Apostleship 280
Division A. Introductory Narrative. Chh. 8 f.
Three faith-healings. Exorcisms and Mighty works. More disciples called. A preaching circuit.
Division B. The Discourse, 9:36–10:42.
List of the twelve. Their instructions. Encouragement to meet persecutions. The reward for their kindly reception.

IV. Book Third. The Hiding of the Revelation . . 288
Division A. Israel is Stumbled. Chh. 11 f.
Jesus and John. Judgment on the unrepentant. Pharisaic opposition. Blasphemy of the scribes. The demand for a sign. Spiritual kin.
Division B. Teaching in Parables, 13:1–53.
Parables before the multitude. Sower, Tares, Mustard-seed, and Leaven. Private exposition. Further parables to the twelve.

V. Book Fourth. Church Administration 297
Division A. Jesus and the Brotherhood. Chh. 14–17.
The *Agapé* in Galilee. The law of "clean" and "unclean." Cleansing of the heart by faith. The *Agapé* in Perea. The revelation of the Christ and Vision of the Son of Man. An epileptic healed.
Division B. The Discourse. Chh. 17:22–18:35.
Avoiding occasions of stumbling. Reconciliation of brethren. The duty of forgiveness.

VI. Book Fifth. The Judgment 308
Division A. Jesus in Judea. Chh. 19–22.
Teachings on the way to the cross. Divorce. The childlike spirit. The commandments of life. Reward for renunciation. The last first. The reward of martyrdom. Triumphal entry to Jerusalem, purging of the temple and challenge from the Sanhedrin. Jesus' answer in parables. Debates in the temple.
Division B. Discourse on Judgment to Come. Chh. 23–25.
Woes on scribes and Pharisees. Wisdom's Lament for God's people and dwelling. Doom of Jerusalem. Revelation of the coming catastrophe, birth-pangs of the Christ, the Great Tribulation, the Coming to Judgment. Be Watchful. The Consummation. Parables of the Coming. Wisdom and Folly, Entrusted Funds, Judgment of the Son of Man.

VII. Epilogue 326
The plot to kill Jesus. The Farewell Supper. Gethsemane. Trial before Caiaphas. Trial before Pilate. Crucifixion. Burial, resurrection, and apostolic commission.

PART IV. THEMES

Theme I. The New Ethic of Jesus and the Law . . 339
Comparison practicable between Mt's view and historic fact. Q nucleus of the First Discourse. Jesus' teaching on Filial Righteousness. Its occasion and elements. Agreement with the historical situation and conditions as shown by Mk and Q. Agreement with other records of Jesus' life and teaching. Mt's additions to the teaching. Q discourses on Abiding Wealth and Prayer. Further discourses. Scribal ethics. Pharisaic worship. Mt on Jesus and the Law compared with Mk and other reports. Mk is anti-Jewish, Mt anti-scribal. Underlying principle the distinction between divine and human law. Appeal to Isaiah. Paul, Mk, and Mt on "precepts of men." Book religion in Jn 5:30–47. The real standpoint of Jesus.

Theme II. The Apostolate 361
Both Divisions of Book II exhibit the same dominant motive. Gospellers must have (a) "mountain-moving" faith; (b) all-enduring courage. The change of emphasis from Mk to Mt. Primary principle in S and modification in L. Mt represents a third stage. The right to support. Abuse and regulation. Endurance of persecution specially emphasized. The Great Tribulation soon to end with the Coming of the Son of Man. The evidential value of the faith-wonder.

Theme III. The Hiding and Revelation of the Mystery . 375
Israel's prerogative as hierophant for the world. Its complement a "hiding of the mystery." Application of the doctrine in Pauline apologetic. Mk's adaptation of this and its development by Mt. Division A of Book III gives the S development of the theme. Israel spiritually blind and deaf. Division B gives the development of Paul and Mk: the parables riddles intelligible only to the elect. Teachings of Jesus behind these two types of apologetic. Jesus' doctrine of the Spirit. His parables of the kingdom.

Theme IV. The Problem of Church Unity . . . 397
Mt again depends on Mk. Division A called for no rearrangement of the narrative, partly because of identity of motive, partly for lack of non-Markan material. Pragmatic aim of Mk's grouping. The Church's peril of disruption in the apostolic age. Lk's method of dealing with the theme. Mk's method. Mt's improvement on Mk. The spirit of Jesus essential to unity. Hence Division B: Quarrel for precedence. Mk contends for Toleration. Mt on Forgiveness and Church administration. Paul counsels the "spiritual" in his Epistles. How to "gain the brother." Restoration of the Lost Sheep. Rules of Church procedure. The Unforgiving Servant.

Theme V. The Messianic Judgment 412
Apocalyptic propensities of Mt. Comparison with Jn. The Son of Man doctrine in primitive preaching. Its use by Jesus. The prophetic and apocalyptic ideals compared. Judgment by the Son of Man universalizes

judgment by the Son of David. Effect of the resurrection faith on apostolic preaching. Jewish apocalypse vs. Hellenistic mysticism. Jesus as Jewish patriot. His "covenant" at the farewell supper. Prophetic ideal of the *Shemoneh Esreh*. Mt's fifth Book culminates in the Judgment of the Son of Man. Modern conceptions of moral retribution compared with apocalypse. Our problem to translate the prophetic ideal of Jesus into terms of modern thought. Apocalypse a cruder form of universalization; but we have a higher example in that of Hellenistic mysticism in Paul and John.

PART V. APPENDED NOTES

		PAGE
NOTE	I. The Date of Papias	439
	II. Meaning of the Term Λόγια	443
	III. Mt and the Anti-Marcionite Prologues	452
	IV. The Little Apocalypse in Mk and Mt	467
	V. Scripture Quotations in S	470
	VI. Mt and the Jewish-Christian Gospels	478
	VII. Matthean Greek and the N Factor	496
	VIII. The Four-document Hypothesis	505
	IX. The Leaven of the Pharisees	511
	X. Addenda	519
INDEX	I. Patristic References	527
INDEX	II. Subjects and Authors	529

ABBREVIATIONS

Gospels, Materials, and Sources

GOSPELS, CANONICAL AND POST-CANONICAL

Canonical

Mt, Mk, Lk, Jn = Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, respectively

Post-canonical

Ev. Hebr. = Gospel according to the Hebrews
Ev. Naz. = Gospel according to the Nazarenes
Ev. Petri = Gospel according to Peter

Classes of Material

P = Peculiar, or "single-tradition" material (*Sondergut*)
Q = "Double-tradition" material (not in Mk)
R = Redactional, *i.e.*, editorial material

Conjectural Sources

S = Second Source (based on Q)
L = Proto-Lk, or Lukan Special Source
M = Proposed Proto-Mt
N = Nazarene targum
O = Oral tradition

Combinations of symbols such as P^{mt}, R^{lk}, are usually self-explanatory, S^{p}, S^{q}, and S^{mk}, indicate that texts thus designated are referred to the Second Source on the evidence of single tradition, double tradition, or triple tradition, respectively.

Modern works frequently employed

BGS.....*Beginnings of Gospel Story*, by B. W. Bacon, 1909.
Btr. I, II, etc..Harnack, *Beiträge zur Einl. in d. N. T.*
I. *Lukas der Arzt*, 1906, Engl. tr. 1907, II; *Sprüche u. Reden Jesu*, 1907, Engl. tr. 1908, etc.
Comm.....*Commentaries* on Mt by Allen, Klostermann, McNeile, Micklem, Plummer, Robinson, Strack-Billerbeck, Weiss, Wellhausen, Zahn, and others.
DB.....Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, 1898–1904.
DCG.....Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, 1906–08.

EB.....*Encyclopaedia Biblica*, 1899–1903.
FG.....*The Four Gospels*, by B. H. Streeter, 1925.
GHD.....*The Gospels as Historical Documents*, by V. H. Stanton, vols. i–iii, 1903–19.
GHTr.....*The Gospel History and its Transmission*, by F. C. Burkitt, 1911[3].
GM.....*The Gospel of Mark. Its Composition and Date*, by B. W. Bacon, 1925.
HS..... *Horae Synopticae*, by Sir J. C. Hawkins, 1899, 1909[2].
HThR.....*Harvard Theological Review.*
ICC.....*The International Critical Commentary.*
Intr.....*Introductions to N. T. Literature* by Bacon, Moffatt, Zahn (Engl. tr. 1917) and others.
JBL.....*The Journal of Biblical Literature.*
JThS.....*The Journal of Theological Studies.*
KG.....*Kanongeschichte*, by Theo. Zahn, 1890.
OS.....*Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem* by Hawkins, Streeter, Allen, Bartlet, and others. Edited by W. Sanday, 1911.
QL.....*Quellen des Lukas*, by B. Weiss, 1907.
SF.....*Die Synoptische Frage*, by P. Wernle, 1899.
SM.....*The Sermon on the Mount*, by B. W. Bacon, 1902.
ZNW.....*Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft.*

PART I

GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE GOSPEL

A. EXTERNAL EVIDENCE

CHAPTER I

THE TRADITION OF MATTHEAN ORIGIN

TRADITION as to the origin of the first Gospel of our canon is reflected for the first time in the work of Papias, bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia, composed about 140 A.D.[1] under the title *Exposition of the Lord's Oracles* (Κυριακῶν λογίων ἐξήγησις).[2] This was Papias' only writing, a five-chaptered reply to the "vain talk" of the many and the "alien commandments" of the false teachers complained of by his older "comrade" Polycarp of Smyrna, and by other church writers of the period.[3] It was based on "traditions of John" and other "elders" who could report "words of apostles." These traditions Papias had gathered through his lifetime and long treasured in memory. Some, he seems to imply, were obtained by himself directly from the apostolic group in Jerusalem known as "the elders, the disciples of the Apostles," others had come to him indirectly through the daughters of Philip the Evangelist (three of whom lay buried with their father at Hierapolis) and through travellers who had "come his way," and whom he had questioned as to what was being said by "Aristion and John," the then surviving members of the group.

Aristion is totally unknown.[4] The "elder" John, clearly distinguished as such from the apostle of the same name mentioned by Papias just before, may be the "John" of Jerusalem, seventh in the group of Jerusalem "elders" the "successors (διαδόχοι) of the Apostles," [5] whose death is placed by Epiphanius in the last year of Trajan (117 A.D.).

The preface (προοίμιον) of Papias' book stated his purpose in writing as paraphrased above. It also stated his qualifications for giving to the "commandments delivered by the Lord to the faith" their true meaning. His authority lay in his accumulated store of "traditions of the elders," which he considered for this purpose "more profitable than books" (he writes shortly after the publication of a work by Basilides, the celebrated Gnostic heretic of Alexandria, in twenty-four chapters of "Exegetics" based on the Gospel of Lk).

[1] See Appended Note I, "Date of Papias."

[2] Strictly "Of the Interpretation (or Interpretations) of the Lord's Oracles Five Books" (ἐξηγήσεως, *al.* ἐξηγήσεων, ε').

[3] *Ep. of Polycarp*, vii. I Tim. 6:3 f, 20 f; Ti. 1:10–16.

[4] See Bacon, s.v. "Aristion" in Hastings' *DCG*.

[5] Thus referred to by several post-apostolic writers; cf. Acts 15:22; 21:18.

Several examples survive, quoted by Irenaeus and others, to show the nature of this "living and abiding voice" which Papias, like the church writers of the generation following, set over against the "books" of outsiders, false teachers who merely gratified an idle curiosity of the multitude when they did not "pervert the oracles of the Lord to their own lusts," as Polycarp complains.

Papias, like Polycarp, particularly resented the Greek tendency to "deny the (bodily) resurrection and (apocalyptic) judgment." It is probably for the reason that he wished especially to confute by well authenticated tradition these two misrepresentations put forth by the false teachers that he places together, at the end of his enumeration of the apostles whose "traditions" he quoted, "Matthew," whose "compend of the oracles" (*σύνταξις τῶν λογίων*) was his prime reliance for these, and "John," whose Revelation he championed as "worthy of belief" (*ἀξιοπιστός*). This involved apostolic authorship; for the book based its message to the churches of Asia concerning the "resurrection and judgment" on an alleged divine communication received by the martyred apostle "in the Spirit" on the Island of Patmos (Rev. 1:9–11).[6]

Debate raged for more than a century after Papias over this claim of apostolic authorship for the Apocalypse of John. The question is indeed important for the understanding of Papias and his times, but may be disregarded in our present enquiry. The moral issue was regarded as more immediately pressing and turned largely on the true meaning of the Lord's words (I Tim. 6:3). These in Papias' time are no longer referred to as mere "words," but being "commandments delivered by the Lord to the faith" (*cf.* Jn 14:21; 15:10; Mt 28:20; Ignatius *ad Eph.* ix, 2), and "derived from the truth itself" like the commandments uttered from Sinai, are called, like the Mosaic, "oracles."[7]

It is very important to observe that Papias' enquiries were directed toward obtaining light on the *meaning* of the accepted "oracles," not toward collecting unknown sayings, a pursuit which could scarcely rise above the level of the "vain talk" and the "alien commandments" which he deplored. Among the "books" he deemed of relatively small value we can imagine him as including the Gospel of Lk (which Basilides had treated as "the" Gospel), or the Gospel of Jn, which he seems to have known but does not mention. More probably his disregard of these later Gospels is due simply to his full

[6] On the true application of the fragment commonly used as a testimony to the fourth Gospel, see the present writer's articles "Latin Prologues to the Fourth Gospel" (*JBL*, XXXII, 3, 1913) and "Marcion, Papias and the Elders" (*JThS*, Jan., 1922). See also Appended Note III.

[7] See Appended Note II, "Meaning of the Term Logia."

reliance on Mt, which contained, as he believed, the complete, authentic, and properly "ordered" teaching of the Lord, committed to writing by one of the Twelve. His sole concern was "the commandments delivered." As we shall see, he felt at liberty to make some use also of the "sayings and doings of the Lord" recorded by Mark from his recollections of the preaching of Peter; but for such resort to an authority not directly apostolic he feels it needful (much to our advantage) to advance special reasons. Mt, for Papias (and apparently for his readers as well), is the standard, unquestioned, complete, authoritative, apostolic "compend of the Lord's commandments." It does not occur to him that it needs defense or authentication any more than contemporary rabbis would think of authenticating the Torah of Moses.

This explanation of Papias' environment, motive, and attitude toward his sources is made needful by certain current misapprehensions. Modern writers are prone to speak of Papias' preference for oral as against written sources as if he could be guilty of the folly of paying more consideration to second- or third-hand report of the utterances of Jesus, transmitted orally, than to a written record which he believed to be from the hand of an apostle!

Almost equally surprising, considering the eminence of its source, is Streeter's extraordinary impression that Papias "disparages" (!) Mt.[8] This seems to stand connected with a view, perhaps derived from Wernle, that the criticism of the "order" of Mk is based on that of Jn (a gospel which Streeter attributes to the Elder John). This view predates by some forty years the rise of controversy concerning Johannine vs. Synoptic "order." Papias apologizes for Mk's lack of "order" precisely because Mk so obviously conflicts with Mt on this point. He cites authority for his use of Mk, with full explanation of Mk's deficiencies, for the very purpose of forestalling objections. Peter, whose follower Mark had been, "had no design of making an ordered compend of the oracles (*σύνταξις τῶν λογίων*), but related sayings and doings of the Lord as occasion required (*πρὸς τὴν χρείαν*)." Thus Mark, when Peter's personal witness was no longer accessible, could do no more than record faithfully what he had heard. Matthew, however, had made the required compend (*συνέταξεν τὰ λόγια*) in proper order. Lk and Jn are entirely unmentioned.

We come thus to Papias' reference to his standard compend of the "oracles" he proposes to interpret, a brief statement because unchallenged save on the obvious point that the compend was in Greek, whereas the language of its alleged author had been "Hebrew." Whether Papias' statement came before or after that defending his supplementary use of Mk, Eusebius, who makes the extract, does not

[8] *FG*, p. 19.

tell us. Its content indicates that the two are at least interrelated. Papias shows what was current and uncontradicted belief in his time concerning our first Gospel in the following sentence: "Matthew compiled the oracles in the Hebrew tongue but every man translated them (*αὐτά*) as he was able." [9]

A discussion of the Papias fragment concerning Mk will be found in *GM*, pp. 22 ff. with incidental treatment of that concerning Mt. The latter is central to the discussion in my article "Why 'According to Matthew' " in *The Expositor* for October, 1920 (VIII, 120). Here only the central facts need be stated.

If, previous to 140 A.D., there had been dispute regarding the apostolic authorship of Mt no intimation of the fact appears in Papias. He is concerned only with the question of translation. He cannot, as in the case of Peter's "reminiscences," give the name of any individual whose translation could be regarded as specially authorized. But he makes the admission not unwillingly because it only enhances the value of his own "Interpretations" (*ἑρμηνείαι*). In former times it had been the custom for preachers to give their own rendering of the "oracles," some better, some worse. Those now given by Papias himself have the support of the living and abiding voice of apostolic tradition. His readers, whose mother-tongue is Greek, are naturally referred to the Greek Mt. (All his logia which survive are in fact based on Mt.) Papias expects his own "interpretations" to be preferred to those of "alien" interpreters not because he is a better linguist but because of his access to the indigenous and continuous tradition of the Church. Such is the simple statement regarding Mt deemed sufficient by Papias' contemporaries, coupled with his own explanation of the difference in language.

Amplification sets in almost at once, after the manner of traditions, supplying new details. From the last decades of the same century writers begin to specify the date. Irenaeus avers that the Gospel was composed "while Peter and Paul were preaching and founding the church at Rome." Later writers aim to be more exact and at the same time to give the Gospel greater antiquity. It was written on occasion of the dispersal of the Twelve from Jerusalem by the persecution of Herod Agrippa I, "twelve years" after the Ascension (42 A.D.). This was a favorite epoch with the earliest church writers. Matthew, it was said, in departing from Jerusalem with the other

[9] *Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνετάξατο* (*al. συνεγράψατο*), *ἡρμήνευσε δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατὸς ἕκαστος.* The *οὖν* resumptive shows that the immediately preceding sentence had dealt with some less closely related subject. The *μέν*, *δέ* brings into contrast the recording in "Hebrew" with the rendering in Greek. The object of the verb is not the Gospel, but the "oracles," whether contained or not contained in the writing.

survivors of the Twelve, left behind him with his disciples as compensation for his absence this record of the Lord's life and teaching.

We need not delay with the later amplifications. As Irenaeus confessedly draws from Papias, and as later writers merely develop the same belief, it is enough to take it in its earliest known form and test it by the internal evidence of the Gospel itself. Fortunately this process of testing has been so thoroughly performed, with such uniformity of general result that we need only record here by a few extracts the verdict of representative scholars.

Criticism exhibits an extraordinary contrast in the attitude it has been slowly driven to assume toward the two declarations of Papias, (1) his utterance regarding Mk, in which he defends his resort to a non-apostolic gospel by citing the opinion of "the Elder," and (2) his utterance regarding Mt, for which he seems to consider authentication needless. Modern criticism was at first slow to accept the statement regarding Mk, but has gradually come to admit that in substance it is surely correct. Less and less do we hear of the pleas for a possible proto-Mk better meeting the implications of the Elder's words. When carefully considered in the light of second-century interests the Elder's cautious commendation of Mk appears to be exactly what we should expect from one of the group of "elders the disciples of the Apostles" when applied to for a valuation of the Roman Gospel.[10] It was known to Justin, Roman contemporary of Papias, as "Memorabilia (*Ἀπομνημονεύματα*) of Peter" with the subtitle "According to Mark." The Elder endorses this belief with certain reserves. Modern criticism does the same.

Just the opposite has been the fate of the tradition which Papias gives without reference to any authority as undisputed current opinion regarding the first Gospel. Modern critics were at first almost unanimous in endorsing his statement regarding Mt. It had in its favor, to start with, the whole weight of fifteen centuries of undisputed acceptance. When questions at last began to be raised [11] it was defended ardently by the greatest New Testament scholars representing by far the most influential school of criticism. Yet today it has scarcely a single defender in its original form. A modified form almost tantamount to rejection is still defended by one, a veteran of ninety years, seconded by a handful of allies.[12]

Challenge to the ancient belief in the priority of Mt came first as a result of enquiry into the literary relation between the first three

[10] See *GM*, pp. 22–49.

[11] Erasmus seems to have led the way.

[12] Zahn's views appear to be shared by Schlatter and Dalman. See Appended Note VII.

Gospels, or the "Synoptic Problem," for the solution of which the first important theory advanced was that of Griesbach, wherein this eminent philologist sought to prove "that the whole Gospel of Mk is extracted (*decerptum*) from the writings of Mt and Lk." Speaking of the publication of this theory in 1790 Moffatt in his well known *Introduction* (1911, p. 177) declares it the "unlucky and prolific dandelion, which it has taken nearly a century of opposition (led by Storr, Knobel, Lachmann, Wilke, Weisse, B. Weiss, Holtzmann, Weizsäcker, and Wendt) to eradicate." Griesbach had indeed the whole weight of ancient opinion in his favor. He obtained the adhesion of the Tübingen scholars, the most important group of New Testament critics during the first half of the nineteenth century. Only by slow degrees, some of the most important contributions coming from Tübingen itself, was Griesbach's theory shown to be false as respects both Mt and Lk. These gospels are indeed in close literary affiliation with Mk, but the supposed relation must be reversed. Both draw from Mk, but the dependence of Mt is much closer and more complete than that of Lk, and hence is easier to prove.

In the list of great names cited by Moffatt perhaps the greatest is H. J. Holtzmann, whose *Synoptische Evangelien* (1863, pp. 15–126) clearly established this dependence. But we may add a few more recent names because of the basic nature of the issue, and because the strong resistance encountered has led modern scholars to a more complete and exhaustive treatment of the question than could otherwise have been expected.

One of the earliest and most notable was that of Scholten, whose patient investigation of every aspect of the question, including study of the editorial method of Mt and of his apparent motive in every variation from Mk as respects order, omission, addition, and change, appeared first in Dutch in 1868 and the following year in German translation under the title *Das Aelteste Evangelium*. We would refer the reader especially to pp. 14–178.

Passing over many of less thorough quality, or less specifically directed to our immediate question, mention should especially be made of Wernle's *Synoptische Frage* (1899), of which pp. 109–195 deal more specifically with the relation of Mt to Mk, the whole question being covered in the same methodical and exhaustive manner as by Holtzmann and Scholten, but with greater conciseness.

English scholars were not less patient, and perhaps excelled in disinterested devotion to the clear testimony of the facts alone. The first edition of Sir John C. Hawkins' *Horae Synopticae* appeared one year earlier than Wernle's *Synoptische Frage*, presenting a simple tabulation of all relevant data. A second edition was required in 1909 because the faithfulness to fact of the scholarly author had meantime

made his book indispensable to every thorough student of the question. The special "statistics and observations bearing on the origin and composition of each Gospel," particularly Mk and Mt, will be found on pp. 114–168 of the second edition.

In 1903 appeared the first of the three successive volumes of the monumental work of the late Canon V. H. Stanton of Cambridge entitled *The Gospels as Historical Documents.* Volume I dealt with the external evidence, or "the use of any of the Gospels in the sub-apostolic age." Its data therefore may be reserved for our discussion of the process of canonization. Volume II appeared in 1909, and dealt (on pp. 30–44 and 323–327), with that element of the problem which more immediately concerns us now, the dependence of Mt and Lk on Mk. "This thesis," says Stanton, "which is now one of the most widely accepted results of modern criticism of the Gospels, cannot claim support, it must be admitted, either from early tradition or from long prescription." Following this statement (on p. 30), Stanton proceeds to show why it has, nevertheless, "increasingly commended itself to students of the Synoptic problem during recent years."

Reference to these detailed demonstrations of the priority of Mk might perhaps be dispensed with were it not for the continued resistance of one of the greatest scholars of our time, Theodore Zahn of Erlangen, a veteran well designated "the prince of conservative critics."[13] It is with particular reference to Zahn's championship of the ancient tradition of the priority of Mt, in the modified form given it by Hugo Grotius, that we cite in addition the judgment of more recent scholars, of whom several are not less noted than Zahn for their opposition to all innovation.

The scholar must indeed either renounce entirely the right to judge of ancient writings by their form and content, or else admit that Mt is not a translation from any other language, but originally composed in Greek. Schlatter himself admits this. Even Zahn, as we have seen, admits the dependence of our canonical Greek Mt on Mk. The general verdict of scholarship asserts in addition that Mt is not the composition of an apostle or other eyewitness, but a relatively late compilation, dependent for its entire narrative outline after the Preamble upon our own Greek Mk, nearly all of which it takes up in shortened and adapted form—dependent also for the better part of its further material upon a Greek document shared by Lk which we have designated S,[14] dependent for the very little it further adds

[13] See his *Introduction* (Engl. transl. by Jacobus 1917), sections 54–57, especially pp. 601 ff. As noted above the views of Dalman and Schlatter resemble Zahn's on this point. Schlatter's volume *Der Evangelist Matthäus* (1929) is considered in Appended Note VII.

[14] See Preface.

upon certain material designated N, which (whether oral or written when taken up) is of highly apocryphal and legendary type, recalling the fantasies of Jewish *haggada*, or the late legends of the Infancy Gospels.[15]

The grounds on which this general conviction of the Priority of Mk is based have been recently summed up by Canon Streeter (*FG*) in his chapter on "The Fundamental Solution":

> (1) Mt reproduces 90% of the subject matter of Mk in language very largely identical with that of Mk; Lk does the same for rather more than half of Mk.
>
> (2) In any average section which occurs in the three Gospels the majority of the actual words used by Mk are reproduced by Mt and Lk, either alternately or both together.
>
> (3) The relative order of incidents and sections in Mk is in general supported by both Mt and Lk; where either of them deserts Mk, the other is usually found supporting him.

In addition to these reasons from (a) content, (b) wording, (c), order, Streeter proceeds to show:

> (4) The primitive character of Mk as respects both form and content.
>
> (5) The distribution of Markan and non-Markan material in Mt and Lk respectively, which "looks as though each had before him the Markan material *in a single document.*"

The reader need only verify the evidence in the pages occupied with Canon Streeter's fuller exposition of this outline, or, failing such personal verification, note the tenor and authority of the pronouncements cited below, to understand why the priority of Mk is commonly spoken of today as the settled verdict of New Testament scholarship.

For present purposes we may limit our survey to the representative *Commentaries* on Mt which have appeared in English since the publication of Zahn's *Introduction*. Of these one of the most conservative is the *ICC* of W. C. Allen (1907), which offers on p. lxxx of the Introduction an implied judgment of Zahn's theory. Speaking of the ancient tradition "to the effect that the first Gospel was written by Matthew the toll gatherer and Apostle in Hebrew" Allen notes that

> the necessary inference must be that our canonical Gospel is a translation of the original Apostolic work.

He continues:

> This tradition (and inference) is, however, directly contradicted by the testimony of the first Gospel itself, for that work clearly shows itself to be a compilation by someone who has interwoven material from another source or other sources into the framework of the second Gospel. This

[15] See Streeter's characterization of this element of Mt, *FG*, pp. 502 f.

renders it difficult to suppose that the book in its present form is the work of the Apostle Matthew. It is indeed not impossible, but it is very improbable, that an Apostle should rely on the work of another for the entire framework of his narrative. If he did so he certainly composed his work in Greek, not in Hebrew, for the first Gospel has largely embodied the Greek phraseology of the second Gospel. It is inconceivable that the compiler should have rendered Mark's Greek into Hebrew, and that this should have been afterwards retranslated into Greek so closely resembling its Markan original.

Allen sees as the only possible conclusion that the tradition of antiquity "has here gone astray."

The *Commentary* of Plummer, already cited, repeats (on p. viii) the judgment of Allen in almost identical language.

More recent, and in many respects superior to both, is that of A. H. McNeile (1915). In discussing the question of authorship on p. xxviii McNeile points out that the evangelist

had no knowledge, or at least made no independent use, of the Hebrew Old Testament.[16] He seems to have lived at some place in Syria where the Christians were not in close touch with Jerusalem, and where the traditions that reached him were of very varying value, ranging from those which bear the unmistakable stamp of genuineness to stories of a purely legendary character, which must have grown up outside the range of the control which apostles or other eyewitnesses would have exercised. His archaeological bent of mind made him collect freely from all quarters with very little critical sifting.

These are judicious words which we must give due weight in considering later the question of provenance.

As regards the ancient tradition and its incompatibility with the internal evidence McNeile's verdict is almost a repetition of that of Allen and Plummer. The author of the work, says McNeile,

was certainly not Matthew the Apostle. Apart from the characteristics just mentioned, one who could write with the paramount authority of an eyewitness would not have been content to base his work on that of a secondary authority. It clearly exhibits reflection, not recollection; it is a portrait of a Person rather than a chronicle of events. Moreover an early tradition had it that S. Matthew wrote in "Hebrew," that is, Aramaic, a tradition which led to a confusion between the canonical Gospel and other evangelic records written in "Hebrew." But our Gospel is not a translation. Though Hebraic to the core, it is quite clearly a Greek composition. If it were a translation its close dependence on the second Gospel would involve the extreme improbability that the latter was translated into Aramaic, that our author employed the Aramaic translation, which was afterwards retranslated into Greek in the present Second Gospel, and

[16] See Appended Note V, "Scripture Quotations in S."

that all the close verbal similarities between that and our First Gospel in Greek were accidental, while the original Greek of the Second Gospel, as well as its Aramaic translation, disappeared.

Further evidence of the general rejection on the part of even the most conservative scholars of Zahn's modification of the primitive tradition is hardly required. It is rather in order that our list of recent commentaries may not seem to overlook an excellent work that we mention in addition the *Commentary* of P. A. Micklem in the Westminster Series (1917) which pronounces the same judgment.[17]

Let it be observed that this general rejection of Zahn's theory is not due to mere superficial objection to its complicated nature. In itself considered there is no insuperable obstacle to the supposition that a writing of the Apostle Matthew in Aramaic should have survived until the times of Mk, been utilized by him as the basis of his Greek Gospel, then have been again utilized by the author of our Greek Mt, who in his translation assimilated his renderings to those of Mk. The really fatal objection is that disclosed by minute and detailed comparison of Mt with Mk along all three of the lines indicated in our extract from Streeter. Systematic comparison proves a relation of dependence both in form and content on the part of Mt upon Mk, and this dependence extends to the very structure of our first Gospel.

But *fas est ab hostibus doceri*. Zahn's argument is worthy of study throughout. He is able to show among other facts dependence by Mk on documents, some of them Aramaic, and to point to real phenomena acknowledged by competent critics as demonstrating a certain Hebraistic element requiring to be accounted for in Mt. We have given this element the provisional designation N because in our judgment it is best accounted for by the survival in oral or written form of certain haggadic traditions among Aramaic-speaking Christians of northeastern Syria. This survival has contaminated that blend of the Greek sources S and Mk which constitutes the substance of our canonical Mt, just as in later times canonical Mt itself has suffered a second, merely textual contamination in the "Zion" group of Mss.

[17] To be entirely accurate we should mention one other quite recent attempt to rescue the theory of Griesbach. Such an ally as J. M. Robertson, well known champion of the theory that Jesus had no historical existence, might be unwelcome to Zahn even were the argument less fallacious. Truth compels us, however, to record, if only as the exception which "proves the rule," that in his volume *Jesus and Judas* (1928) Robertson seeks to account for the general abandonment of the doctrine of the priority of Mt by the vested interest of the theologians (!). Reluctant to accept his theory of the mythical origin of gospel story they have preferred as more defensible Mk's story of "the beginning of the gospel" to Mt's account of a supernatural birth. By the aid of a few warmed-over extracts from Baur, Robertson finds it as easy to reinstate Griesbach as to vindicate the noble aims of Judas Iscariot.

by infusions from *Ev. Naz.* *A priori* it cannot be proved that the source of the precanonical contamination was not an actual Aramaic composition of the Apostle Matthew. Only detailed study of the element N itself can determine its derivation. There will be few, however, of those who have made this study, to dissent from Streeter's judgment of the character of N expressed in the passage to which we have already referred.[18]

If the general verdict of New Testament scholars brings small satisfaction to Zahn and his allies in their attempt to vindicate the ancient tradition based on the statement of Papias and given currency for nearly fifteen hundred years by Jerome and Augustine, the nonagenarian scholar is entitled to reciprocate a *tu quoque* on his opponents in respect to a more modern tradition which has no better foundation. My own article above referred to voicing protest against the unlaid ghost of Schleiermacher's theory is little more than an echo of the disproof offered in section 54 of Zahn's monumental *Introduction*, a disproof already offered long before by Zahn's great adversary Hilgenfeld.

But something more than disproof seems to be required. Let it be shown by simple reference to the text that Papias had nothing to say about any compilation of the "oracles" save our own well known Mt (almost equally well known in his times), the reply comes back, "Well, if he did not, the Elder did." Let it then be further shown that Papias does not refer this tradition to the "Elder," the reply is made, "From whom else could he derive it?" This obsession represents the second "idol of the cave" in the problem of our first Gospel. A partial answer may be offered later to this demand. Meantime it will be well to call renewed attention to that portion of the tradition which receives most consideration from Zahn. In the section already referred to he makes his third and most important observation upon it as follows:

> The fact deserves more attention than has been paid to it heretofore, that Papias does not speak of the translation of Mt's writing, but of the words of Jesus which it contained. The idea that the words ἡρμήνευσε δ' αὐτὰ (*sc.* τὰ λόγια) ἕκαστος mean that a number of written translations or revisions of Mt's Gospel were made, can be arrived at only under the presupposition already shown to be untenable, that τὰ λόγια was the title of a book.

Zahn is unquestionably correct in maintaining that "Papias is talking about *oral translation*, and, indeed, oral translation such as was made in assemblies of Greek-speaking churches or congregations whose language was mixed." He mentions the well known practice

[18] *FG*, pp. 502 f. On the Hebraistic element of Mt see below, Chap. XI, and Appended Note VII. On the Jewish-christian Gospels see Appended Note VI.

of "targuming," continued for the benefit of Christians who did not know Greek in the Aramaic-speaking churches of southern Syria as late as the fourth century. He does not mention the Nazarene churches of northern Syria where the same practice continued at least down to the time of the composition of the Aramaic gospels still known to us through the extracts of Eusebius, Jerome, and Epiphanius. Neither does he bring into logical connection with it the facts he himself adduces with great force in his *KG* II, 2, App. IX, 3 (pp. 665 ff.) concerning the region of circulation (*Verbreitungsgebiet*) of the Aramaic *Gospel of the Nazarenes*. It is true that Jerome's happy thought of identifying this late and dependent composition with the "authentic Hebrew" of the Apostle Matthew was long since proved a mare's nest. Both it and the Aramaic "Gospel according to Jn" and "Book of Acts," which Epiphanius found in use besides this "Hebrew Gospel according to Mt" among the Christians at Tiberias in Galilee, were (as Epiphanius distinctly says) "translations," that is, targums of the same type as the Synagogue targums of the Old Testament, paraphrases embellished with edifying supplements and interpretations superimposed upon the original, which in the case of the Christian writings were simply our own canonical books. Jerome's extracts from the "*Hebraica veritas*" are therefore of small value to establish the true text of Mt. But they are of great value for the light they shed upon the practice of "targuming" in the zone of Aramaic-speaking Christianity extending eastward from Antioch beyond the Euphrates. This district included the tribes known to Pliny as "Nazarenes," located "across the river (Marsyas)" from Apamea, and Beroea-Aleppo where Jerome *c.* 375 professed to have seen "the authentic Hebrew."

For earlier than the written targum, (already known to Hegesippus *c.* 160, and "discovered" by Pantaenus of Alexandria on his famous journey to "the nations of the East" *c.* 180)[19] must be placed the practice of oral "targuming" among the Aramaic-speaking churches of this wide area. Its eastward limit may perhaps be fixed from the travels of Abercius, Bishop of Hieropolis in Phrygia, who journeyed about 190 "with Paul as guide" across "the Syrian plain," welcomed by the churches of "all its cities" until "after crossing the Euphrates" he came to Nisibis. Josephus has much to tell of the Jewish population in these regions. In the preface to his *Jewish War* he reveals their language conditions. The book was originally written in his "mother-tongue" (Aramaic) for the benefit of the multitudes of his fellow-countrymen dwelling at the time (80–90) in Mesopotamia and Adiabene as well as in Parthia and "furthest Arabia" (Ἀράβων τὲ τοὺς πορρωτάτω). Adiabene had become Jewish in faith under Izates

[19] See below, and *cf.* Appended Note VI.

(40–64).[20] The border states to the west and southwest along the great trade-route which from Trajan's time connected the Parthian Empire with the Roman province of Syria shared the vicissitudes of Adiabene as respects race, culture, religion, and language. Portions of this region between Damascus and Nisibis, the "Arabia" of Josephus and probably of Paul also (Gal. 1:17), were Christianized from very early times. The new religion took root especially in the great cities, whose language was Greek, Damascus being the starting point (Acts 9:1–19; Gal. 1:17).

As an example of the spread of the gospel eastward from Antioch in the earliest times into this bilingual region, where in the cities Greek was still the dominant language, so that even synagogues of the large Jewish population employed it in public worship, we may take Edessa, metropolis of Osrhoene. This is the modern Urfa, on the east side of the Euphrates, enclosed in its great western bend, and so for the first century under Parthian suzerainty rather than Roman, though just over the border. It was a trading center of very high importance, and a seat of Greek culture. A few miles to the north on the west bank of the river lay Samosata, whence came in the second half of the second century the *Dialogues* of Lucian, composed in some of the most cultured Greek since Demosthenes. Samosata was the capital of Commagene and in later times a great Christian center. Further east, across the Tigris lay Nisibis, still more famous. Between Nisibis and Edessa stretched the broad and fertile plains of Adiabene ruled since 40 A.D. by a royal house converted to Judaism.

If, then, Antioch's Christian conquests extended westward under Paul and Barnabas to regions whose native tongues had in the cities been submerged by Greek, we may be sure that they extended later (or perhaps even earlier, during the unknown years which Paul speaks of as spent "in Arabia" (Gal. 1:17), or as occupied by mission work "in Syria and Cilicia" (Gal. 1:21)) to the cities along Antioch's great trade-route to the east. For in these cities Greek was still the dominating tongue, but the submerged speech, destined within a century to reassert itself as "Syriac," was the Aramaic of the whole Semitic world.

More is known of the Christianization of Edessa and Osrhoene than of the adjoining regions, therefore we can form the best judgment of conditions in "Arabia," or "Assyria" as the region came later to be called, from this typical center of Grecized Semitic culture. Let us treat Edessa as typical. The earliest beginnings of its Christian history are lost. They have left no trace besides the legend of the letter of Edessa's king Abgar the Black (A.D. 13–50) to Jesus, followed by the king's conversion by Addai, one of the Seventy

[20] Jos., *Ant.*, XX, ii–iv.

disciples. Eusebius relates the story as translated by himself from the Syriac in the first book of his *Church History* (I, xiii). All it can convey to us is the bare fact that the church which reassembled in Edessa after the sack and burning of the city by Lusius Quietus in the Parthian campaign of Trajan (116 A.D.), a church probably Syriac in speech, which furnished a center for the mission-work of Tatian (*c.* 170), and whose "temple" was destroyed by the great flood of 201, believed itself to have had a predecessor, and held the name of "Trajan" in abhorrence as the arch-persecutor.

This church of northeastern Syria has thus a prehistoric period, a semihistoric (covering just a century to the seizure of Edessa by Caracalla), and a third in which it emerges into the full light of day with a great Syriac literature of its own. According to Prof. F. C. Burkitt, our great authority on the beginnings of Syriac Christianity, Edessa "must have been a centre of literary culture long before the coming of Christianity to it, and the earliest surviving writings have an ease and fluidity which seems to reflect traces of Greek influence."[21] But even in later, Christian, times the influences which gave rise to this culture and literature came from the west. A break occurs in the local episcopal succession after the names of Addai and Aggai, the traditional first founders of the church. The third bishop, Palut, receives his ordination not from his predecessor Aggai, but from Serapion, Bishop of Antioch (!) about 190–211 A.D. As Professor Burkitt puts it:

> We are thus confronted in the *Doctrine of Addai* with two theories of the rise of Christianity in Edessa. On the one theory, which is that maintained in the body of the work, Christianity was planted there in the first century of our era; on the other, which is that of the epilogue, the third president of the Christian society at Edessa was not ordained bishop till about 200 A.D., and Christianity itself cannot have reached the district much before the middle of the second century.

Professor Burkitt's own conclusion naturally supports the latter alternative, for he is concerned with that Syriac-christian literature whose beginnings are marked by the Old Syriac Gospels (*c.* 160) and later the introduction from Rome (of course again by way of Antioch) by Tatian, disciple of Justin Martyr, of the *Diatessaron*, or four-fold Gospel Harmony. It is still within this second period that the great figure of Bardesanes emerges, poet, philosopher, and church leader, whom the church in northern Syria (to its own hurt) refuses to tolerate, decreeing him Gnostic and heretic.

But we are interested in the other theory, that of an original first-century planting. Not because it has any historical documents, nor

[21] *Early Eastern Christianity*, 1904, p. 7.

because the *Doctrine of Addai* can offer anything more to our purpose than the bare attestation (in itself wholly probable) of a prehistoric period in the cities of Euphratean Syria, a period when under Greek culture, language, and institutions, among a Jewish population accustomed to use Greek even for its synagogue services, Christianity found a foothold. This planting came, however, from the liberal, Petrine community of Antioch; not, as in Transjordan, from the Palestinian churches which looked to James as chief authority. The Ebionite churches in Transjordan, it is true, used the Greek language, in which their gospel, the *Ev. Hebr.*, was written. But in their attitude toward Paul and the Pauline writings the Ebionites stood at the opposite pole from the "Nazarenes" of northeastern Syria.

We must defer to an Appended Note (No. VI) discussion of the relation of Mt to the Aramaic gospels, but none will dispute the fact that it is with the *Ev. Naz.* alone that it has close affinity; nor will any modern scholar deny that the Aramaic is here translated from the Greek and not vice versa. In the earlier time, shortly after Josephus composed his *Jewish War* in Aramaic for the benefit of his fellow countrymen in Adiabene, Parthia, and Arabia, if Christianity had already made its way from Antioch eastward among the Greek-speaking Jewish synagogues, these doubtless followed the Jewish practice of oral "targuming" from such Greek gospels as reached them. These early gospels, however, would not be Mt or Lk, but S and Mk, from which Mt was soon compounded, a Greek gospel tinged by Aramaic infiltration.

As Zahn observes, this process of "targuming" may have been known to Papias by report. It can scarcely have been known to him by personal observation in the Greek-speaking churches of Phrygia and Asia. If, then, his statement possesses any value at all, it should tend to throw much needed light on the source of his tradition. Zahn, it is true, would have it understood that the practice was that of the bilingual churches of Palestine. But, as McNeile makes plain, the peculiarities of N are such as to make it almost impossible to imagine this material originating within the sphere of Jerusalem, or any other save a north-Syrian region beyond the control of apostolic supervision.

Remoteness of writer and readers alike both in place and time from the scenes described is indeed revealed in Mt not alone by the apocryphal character of the supplements but also by the point of view unaffectedly assumed by the evangelist. It is true that Mt shows better geographical knowledge than Mk, and especially is better informed concerning Jewish conditions and institutions. If Rome be the cradle of Mk nothing else could be expected. But when in 7:29 Mt substitutes "*their* scribes" for Mk's simple "the scribes,"

and follows this up in 9:35; 13:54 with "their synagogue(s)" (Mk 6:2 "the" synagogue) and in 11:1 "their cities"—when in 9:26 and 31 he speaks of "that land" [22] and in 14:35 of "that place" the impression the reader receives is not what one would expect from a resident of the country writing for residents. A resident would hardly be apt to speak of the Syrophoenician as a "Canaanite" (15:22) or remark that the field bought with the thirty pieces of silver "was called the Field of Blood unto this day" (27:8), still less that the charge of theft of Jesus' corpse "was spread abroad *among the Jews* until this day" (28:15). "Gadarenes" in 8:28 and "Magadan" in 15:39 are well meant, though dubious, corrections of the impossible "Gerasenes" of Mk 5:1 and the unintelligible "Dalmanutha" of Mk 8:10, but the vagueness of "the mountain" in 5:1 (Mk 3:13), 15:29, and especially "the mountain where Jesus had appointed" in 28:16, and the vagueness of "that place" for an unnamed village of Gennesaret (14:35) are incredible in an eyewitness and difficult to imagine in a later resident of the country. *Ev. Hebr.* is a dependent and vastly inferior writing, but its author at least shows local knowledge by substituting "Mount Tabor" for the "high mountain" of the Temptation whence one may see "all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them." R^{mt} gets his geography largely from the Old Testament.

The question of provenance is thus inextricably bound up with that of authenticity. Streeter argues (*FG*, pp. 500 ff.) for Antioch as the birthplace of the first Gospel, as follows:

> The Patristic evidence that Mt was written in Palestine in Hebrew is impressive—until we reflect that all the Fathers had read the statement of Irenaeus (either in the original or as reproduced by Eusebius), and that Irenaeus himself had read Papias' dictum on τὰ λόγια. Thus the tradition can be traced back to a single root; and, quite apart from the correctness of our interpretation of Papias, it cannot be authentic, for our Gospel of Mt being based on the Greek Mk cannot be a translation from the Aramaic. At the same time the evidence of Irenaeus and Papias has a negative value. It proves that Mt was not produced either in Rome or Asia Minor, but was believed to have originally come from the East.

Let the "negative value" of this testimony pass for what it will. Those who believed the Gospel to have been written by the Apostle in "Hebrew" would certainly believe it to have "come from the East" whether knowledge of its provenance had anything to do with their acceptance of the title or not. Fortunately it is not necessary to labor the point, as ancient and modern opinion are practically at one on its Syrian derivation.[23] Neither need we delay with the

[22] On the expression, see McNeile *ad* 9:26.

[23] Von Soden's reference to Mt as a "Roman" gospel (below, p. 71) forms a great exception.

sporadic suggestion of Egypt as a possible birthplace, which Streeter justly dismisses as "impossible."[24] What concerns us more is his novel argument from the original "anonymity," of Mt, an observation of real value, though given (as we believe) a false application in Streeter's argument for Antioch as its place of origin.

His argument is as follows:

> We can be sure that Mt originated in an important church for the simple reason that, apart from the title, which, of course, forms no part of the original text, it is anonymous. The significance of this anonymity is apt to be overlooked. The Apocryphal Gospels all try to claim authority by definite and often reiterated assertions of Apostolic authorship in the text itself. The spurious *Gospel of Peter* (2d century A.D.), for instance, goes out of its way to introduce "I, Simon Peter," just before the account of the Resurrection. Mt is anonymous; it makes no claim to authority, gives no hint of authorship.

The point is well taken. In the *original* home of the first Gospel it required no special name or title. It circulated, like similar compositions among Gnostic one-gospel men (followers of Basilides, or Marcion, or Cerinthus), simply as "the" Gospel. It is actually thus quoted by several early writers, though there is difficulty in deciding in many cases whether Mt in particular or just the written record in general is meant. The specific title "according to Matthew," with the tradition which later developed on the basis of this title, was created for the purpose of distinguishing it from other gospels circulating simultaneously in the same church. For this very reason Streeter's proposal of Antioch as its place of *origin* is extremely improbable.

We must sharply distinguish between place of *origin* and focus (or foci) of *dissemination*, the locality (or localities) which Streeter designates a "centre of distribution."

For the wide acceptance of Mt a very large factor, if not the greatest, was the title, which was early understood to imply apostolic authorship. It is precisely this which is *not* likely to have been conferred upon the Gospel at its actual birthplace, or where its origin was best known (at least not in the sense of direct composition by the Apostle). The title was prefixed in some other, perhaps neighboring, locality, where the Gospel came into competition with older gospels already in circulation such as Mk, S, or Lk.

Streeter's argument for Antioch as the place of *origin* of Mt ignores this distinction. His plea is that "the Gospel would not have been generally accepted as Apostolic unless it had been backed by one of

[24] The first gospels known in Egypt appear to have been two, both, naturally, composed in Greek. They were distinguished by title as (1) *The Gospel according to the Hebrews* and (2) *The Gospel according to the Egyptians.*

the great churches." True enough. But "backing" is not needed for composition, and leaves no mark on the pages of the work. Simeon and Anna proclaimed the Christ-child in Jerusalem, but the birthplace was Bethlehem.

"Backing" affects *dissemination*. And the foci of dissemination are often not limited to a single church. We may suppose, for instance, that Mt, having come into circulation at Antioch from some more eastern locality of mixed Aramaic and Greek speech, received in Antioch the title "According to Matthew" to distinguish it from gospels already in circulation at that great metropolis of Gentile Christianity. If in Antioch it acquired special prestige through the favor of Ignatius the bishop, and was by him subsequently brought to the favorable knowledge first of the churches of Phrygia and Asia through which Ignatius journeyed to his famous martyrdom, and ultimately to that of Rome itself, the "backing" of Antioch, Ephesus, and Rome would surely suffice to account even for the immense prestige soon enjoyed by Mt, wholly apart from what it was called or understood to be in its *birthplace*, whether important or obscure.

This question of the actual birthplace of Mt is vital because environment leaves its mark on literary products. It cannot, therefore, be adequately discussed save in connection with the internal evidence. We may, however, even at this point, advert once more to the able and acute reasoning of Zahn, who cites evidence by no means to be disregarded, even if adduced in support of a theory of origins which is generally and justly dismissed as incredible. The birthplace of Mt was undoubtedly in Syria, in some locality where Jewish traditions and even some remote influence from the Hebrew Old Testament still lingered. But, as McNeile correctly infers from the late and apocryphal character of N, these circles, though "Hebraic to the core," were "not in close touch with Jerusalem" but "outside the range of the control which apostles or other eyewitnesses would have exercised."

To what other region of Greek speech but Hebraic traditions shall we look? It is Zahn himself who calls attention to another stream of tradition as to the provenance of Mt, manifestly related to that which comes to us through Papias, yet (if Zahn may be trusted) not derived from it. This independent tradition comes from Alexandria, where we have no reason to suppose Papias was known. Eusebius relates it [25] as derived from the visit of Clement's predecessor Pantaenus from a missionary journey made by the great churchman about 180 A.D. to "the nations of the East." The journey, whether begun by land or sea, would take him through the flourishing regions already described of Syria Euphratensis, east and southeast of Antioch, and so

[25] *HE*, V. x.

down the Euphrates valley, for "he penetrated as far as India," though by "India" perhaps only the territory adjoining the Persian Gulf is meant. The "nations of the East" inhabited a region supporting, as we have seen, a huge Jewish population of great influence among their fellow-Jews. At least in the more northern parts it was bilingual, Greek and Aramaic being used in different proportions in various localities. In the cities the Greek tended at first to eliminate the Semitic languages, in the rural districts, and ultimately the cities also, the reverse was true. Aramaic, as we know, was the language of the Nazarene church in Beroea-Aleppo in Jerome's time. It is still spoken among the Nusairi mountaineers of northeastern Lebanon, just as among the Mandean (Gnostic) "Nazarenes" of Babylonia the speech is still Aramaic in type. Naturally among these Christians "of mixed speech" the practice of oral "targuming" would prevail until written Aramaic gospels based on the Greek came into circulation, to be replaced in turn by the Syriac.

The point of present interest is that Pantaenus brought back to Alexandria from his visit to "the nations of the East" the report that he had found among the Christians there a gospel "written in Hebrew characters and the Hebrew language" which they ascribed to the Apostle Matthew, claiming that it had been left with them by the Apostle Bartholomew, by whom their churches were said to have been founded. Eusebius, to whom we owe the tale, hesitates to recognize in this document a survival of the "authentic Hebrew," as well he might; but there is nothing against its having been a copy of the *Ev. Naz.* here explicitly called by the name of "Matthew." Pantaenus' experience merely anticipates that of Apollinaris of Laodicea and Jerome in Chalcis between Antioch and Aleppo, just as Jerome's anticipates that of impressionable visitors to the library of St. Mark's in Venice or to the Synagogue of the Samaritans in Nablous. Stripped of its legendary features Pantaenus' report merely witnesses to an eastward spread of the same tradition which in its western (Antiochian?) branch appears in Papias. The Aramaic Mt shown to Pantaenus in Mesopotamia had not been brought thither from Jerusalem by Bartholomew, but it may well attest the wider circulation among Aramaic-speaking Christians of Jewish stock eastward from Antioch of targums in written form based on the canonical Greek. Once more let it be said: These written targums which we partly know, will have had, like their predecessors for the Old Testament, an oral origin. But for the supporting main stock of these Christian targums, oral as well as written, we should look to the Petrine evangelic records of Antioch, where Mk and S, if not Lk also, were already current.

We cannot here anticipate discussion belonging to our study of the

internal evidence, in particular the factor N. But in order that justice may be done to the witness of Pantaenus and its possible bearing on the question of the birthplace of Mt it may be worth while to call attention to the experience of a region where the influx of Jews of alien tongue and traditions within a generation has produced effects surely not unlike those which gave birth to our first Gospel. In the vicinity of New York Jewish immigrants of the first generation maintain their synagogue organization and practice. Newspapers are published in Yiddish; Yiddish and traces of Hebrew continue to have a limited currency among the orthodox. In the second generation little of this remains. The "liberal" synagogue rapidly eclipses the orthodox, English takes the place of Yiddish even among those who remain "Hebraic to the core" in matters of religion. The Bible used is an English translation of the Old Testament; even the Prayer Book has the Hebrew only on one side of the page.

In the progressive Hellenization of the cities of northeastern Syria the Jewish synagogues must have experienced something similar. Some became Christian. Semitic names would continue, and to some extent Jewish forms, traditions, and speech. But the latter would soon give way. The younger generation, at least in the cities, would require the use of the Greek language. In all periods the dependence of these Eastern churches has been mainly on Antioch. In 90–100 A.D. the supreme apostolic authority would be Peter, head of the Antiochian succession. Their gospel writings would be those fundamental at Antioch, the Markan "Reminiscences of Peter," and S. The same blend is fundamental in Lk also, but the blend Mk, Mt, Lk, appears only in the *Ev. Petri*, still used in 200 A.D. at Rhossus near Antioch.

Between Damascus and the Euphrates some reflection of local conditions would also be apt to make itself felt. The days of "targuming," when "oracles" of the Lord were translated orally according to the preacher's ability, would be apt to leave their mark. In the exceptional case of actual survival of the Aramaic speech, as at Aleppo, these Aramaic targums of the Greek Gospels would ultimately take written forms, some of which we know. In other cases the oral renderings of the Lord's words, particularly fulfilments of Scripture in the events of his life, would linger on to leave their impress even on the Greek writings of (Christianized) synagogue use.

So with our Gospels of Mt and Lk. The more characteristically Palestinian traditions of Jewish type are reflected in Lk. Particularly in Acts a Jacobean tradition is in evidence. Mt, though correct in speech, is "Hebraic to the core"; but its distinctive material (P^{mt}) suggests an environment "not in close touch with Jerusalem" and

outside the range of control which apostles or other eye-witnesses would have exercised." For its birthplace we should look to the Greek-speaking Jewish-christian communities of northern and northeastern Syria, which took their type of Christian teaching from Antioch and looked to Peter as sole arbiter of faith and practice, but retained echoes from earlier days of oral "targuming."

CHAPTER II

THE ROOT OF THE TRADITION

A VERDICT of competent judges so decisive as that recorded in the preceding chapter against the tradition of Matthean authorship would seem at first to leave no room for further enquiry. If the first Gospel is not the work of the Apostle Matthew, not a translation from the "Hebrew," and did not originate in Palestine, how can any further use be made of the fallacious belief?

The answer is that even illusions have their *raison d'être*, which it is the duty of every critic to sound to the bottom. Critics are commonly classed as "liberal" or "conservative." Every genuine critic must be both. The difference is only that "conservative" critics are more sanguine than others of discovering some latent crumb of truth in traditions that to their fellows appear hopeless. Every one of the critics whose verdict against the Matthean tradition was cited in Chapter I is commonly classed as a "conservative," however coincident in their judgment of the Matthean tradition with scholars classed as "liberal." The "critic" owes his name to his function as "judge" (κρίτης). But he would be lacking in the very first of "judicial" qualities if he failed to give sympathetic attention to the plea against which the verdict has been ultimately cast. Moreover "No thoroughfare" is marked over the road which he must take until the last fragment of valid obstruction has been removed. What account, then, can be given of the mistaken tradition?

Behind the earliest known forms of the tradition of authorship lies the story of its formation, which in the case of Mt can only be reached through the indirect witness of extracts, employments, and echoes in primitive writers apparently acquainted with this Gospel, but whose estimate of it must be inferred from the amount and character of their employment of the work in comparison with their employment of other sources.

In dealing with Streeter's attempt to make Antioch the birthplace of Mt instead of its first great focus of dissemination we have had occasion to take up in a preliminary way certain evidences of the spread both of the Gospel itself and the report concerning its origin almost a generation before the date of Papias' *Expositions*. If now we turn to the indirect evidence of unacknowledged employments in earlier writers, there will be general assent to the statement that clear

evidence of the use of Mt appears first in the letters of Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, whose journey to martyrdom in Rome about 115 A.D. carried him past the Pauline "churches of Asia," with which he had notable contact both orally, through delegates who attended him while a prisoner, and also by letters written to the churches at their request. One of the letters is addressed to Polycarp of Smyrna, others to several of the churches of Phrygia and Proconsular Asia, one addresses the church at Rome.

All critics draw inferences from the undoubted employment of Mt by Ignatius. Other employments of the period are either dubious as respects their derivation from Mt rather than some other evangelic record, as in the case of two citations of "words of the Lord" in Clement of Rome (95 A.D.),[1] or occur in writings whose own date is dubious, as in the reference of Ps-Barnabas (132 A.D. ?) to the "scripture" (!) "Many called, few chosen." With the latter group must be classed quite a number of unacknowledged employments in *The Teaching of the Twelve*,[2] several of which are certainly referable to Mt, as where the writer exhorts his readers to regulate their prayers, almsgivings, and all their deeds "as ye find it in the gospel of our Lord." Here a written record is referred to which can only be Mt, no other gospel containing such directions as Mt 6:1–18. Unfortunately we cannot be sure that the writer in speaking of "the" gospel would not also include the directions of Jesus "according to" any other evangelist who might preserve them. Moreover judgments of the date of *Didaché* vary from 90 to 140 A.D. It was probably a church manual in use at Antioch in this general period, but whether earlier or later than Ignatius is difficult to determine. Needless to add that the name "Matthew" nowhere appears before Papias. If, then, we would form any worth-while idea of the "root" of the tradition of Matthean origin for Mt, careful scrutiny must be made of these unacknowledged employments.

Zahn maintains, as we have seen, that there really was once a Palestinian gospel written by the Apostle Matthew in Aramaic. This, he believes, was unfortunately allowed to disappear after Mk had copied from it the best elements of his Gospel, whereupon another unknown writer constructed our present Mt out of the Greek Mk blended with the original Aramaic gospel from which Mk had drawn. We shall assume that enough has already been said in disproof of this apologetic. It attempts to defend a statement of Papias made on entirely unknown authority at the cost of the only truly ancient and trustworthy tradition we possess concerning gospel origins, that is, Papias'

[1] Polycarp (115) cites the same logia, either employing Clement or else Clement's compend.

[2] Referred to hereinafter as *Didaché*.

other statement concerning Mk, which he adduces on the authority of "the Elder." True conservatism would suggest the more docile attitude toward the witness of the Elder, the more sceptical toward that of Papias.

But we have also a considerable body of scholars, particularly those of English speech, who refuse to admit the validity of Zahn's interpretation of Papias, and who, if forced to acknowledge that Papias himself can only have referred to our own Mt as a compilation (σύνταξις) of the logia he (Papias) had in mind to interpret, continue to maintain that at least his informant "the Elder" referred to another writing. Streeter, for example, considers that the "single root" of the whole misreport of antiquity concerning our first Gospel was this misunderstanding of Papias. "The Elder" told of "Matthew" and his compilation of "oracles of the Lord"; but he was speaking of another writing, a Teaching Source now represented by the element SQ. If the Matthean tradition really has any such "single root" we have the deepest interest to discover it. If not, it is almost equally important to dispel the illusion, for it occupies the foreground in a very large proportion of minds given to the tracing up of sources underlying our canonical Gospels.

As already noted the illusion of "the Elder" as authority for the Matthean tradition is entirely without foundation in the text. Papias leaves his bare statement unsupported, giving not the slightest intimation whence he derived it. "The Elder John" is merely a modern guess.

But it is not even a good guess, because Eusebius, who promises his readers such information as he can find on these points, would have been only too pleased to lend the support of the Elder's authority to the Matthean tradition had Papias supplied it. Since neither Eusebius nor any of the ancient Fathers who ransacked the pages of Papias for information of this kind, tells anything of the derivation of the statement it is more probable that Papias adduced no authority for it. Such is the conclusion of Meyer (*Commentary on Mt*, transl. of Christie, 1884, p. 3, note 1) in answer to Sieffert, Ebrard, Thiersch, Delitzsch, and others; a conclusion based not merely on the silence of Eusebius but on the contrast in mode of introduction of the two extracts. Eusebius refers to the former as "a tradition put forward concerning Mark." As to the latter he merely says: "But as concerning Matthew this is said" (*sc.* by Papias).

For we are rightly admonished by Zahn to observe the interest in which Papias puts forward the statement. He is not concerned to give information concerning the literary labors of the Apostle Matthew, but only to forestall objections to his own use of a record of the logia which though ascribed to the Aramaic-speaking apostle is ac-

tually written in Greek. That is, the utterance is made solely on the issue of language. Papias is not attempting to gratify the curiosity of those who might ask how, and on what authority these "commandments delivered by the Lord to the faith" were transmitted, but those who asked why the Gospel is written in Greek if its author spoke Hebrew. Papias explains that the well known compend of the logia made by the Apostle Matthew now extant in Greek was originally compiled in "Hebrew," a fact which he considers to be attested by the former practice of targuming in bilingual churches.

Accordingly we must limit ourselves, if we would reach a reliable conception of the tradition as it *came* to Papias and is assumed by him to be familiar to his readers, to a minimum which cannot be due to mere inference on his part. Papias knew that the language of Jesus and the Apostles was Aramaic, or, as he and most of his Greek-speaking contemporaries call it, "Hebrew"; whereas Mt, the compend of the logia in his hands, is written in Greek. *If he had information*, authentic or otherwise, that the book had the Apostle Matthew as author, he would almost inevitably infer that the Greek was a translation. The converse is inadmissible. It is incredible that Papias should make the former statement as a mere guess, naming "Matthew" by conjecture alone as the particular apostle concerned. That portion of the statement at least comes to him from current report. It is repeated without special emphasis as commonly admitted tradition. Contrariwise it would be almost inevitable that Papias or others should draw from the title "According to Matthew" as an obvious corollary that the original language of the book had been "Hebrew." Since, then, this secondary statement is demonstrably contrary to fact it is likely that Papias adds it to the tradition by simple conjecture.

We therefore have no assurance of anything more in the tradition *as it came to Papias* than simply the title, superscribed as now, "According to Matthew." In Papias' age, though not necessarily in the earlier generation, this would be understood in the sense of personal authorship. If this title had ever encountered opposition Papias seems unaware of the fact. Mt was to everybody then, as to the multitude now, just "The Gospel according to Matthew." If Matthew spoke "Hebrew" then of course this was a "translation."

One other item of the tradition may be added to the title of the book as having possibly come to Papias by report. The mere statement that the Apostle Matthew in making his compend had used the "Hebrew" language cannot be relied upon as traditional. It could equally well be, and probably is, mere inference. But the reference to "targuming" as a practice once prevalent in the churches, a reference made in support of the translation theory, can hardly be

drawn from Papias' personal experience. It is true to fact among the bilingual churches whether of southern or northern Syria, but there is nothing to show that it prevailed among those of Phrygia or Proconsular Asia. Zahn may be straining the distinction between aorist and imperfect when he insists that the aorist ἡρμήνευσε ("translated") in Papias' statement implies a practice to which he could not personally testify; but the actual environment, and Papias' seeming ignorance of the difference between Hebrew and Aramaic, make it more probable on other grounds that he is speaking by hearsay only.

Whence, then, does this somewhat vague information come? As before, "the Elder" is an improbable source. Reference to him would probably have been explicit. If the explanation which serves to forestall objections to the Matthean tradition on the score of language comes from the same sources as the tradition itself we may look for this source to the foci of dissemination and the "backing" which gave to Mt its extraordinary prestige. If an individual name be demanded, Ignatius, who twenty-five years before had passed through Phrygia and Asia, using this Gospel in his letters and almost certainly commending it orally as an antidote to the heresies he so vigorously denounces, is much more likely than John the Elder to have first given currency to the statements on which Papias relies for his confident but mistaken assertions regarding Mt.

We have still to enquire whether the predecessors of Papias, in whose hands Mt must have circulated under the same title it still bears, understood the preposition "according to" in the same strict sense as he. Obviously when such titles as *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, or *Gospel according to the Egyptians*, were given, it was not so taken. In fact Faustus, the Manichean opponent of Augustine in the fifth century, pointed out that the preposition κατά as here employed is ambiguous and does not necessarily imply personal authorship. The real facts in the case are admirably stated in the opening sentence of Plummer's *Commentary* already referred to:

> In no case is the title to a book of the New Testament part of the original document. It was in all cases added by a copyist, and perhaps not by the first copyist. Moreover, in all cases it varies considerably in form, the simplest forms being the earliest. The "according to" neither affirms nor denies authorship; it implies *conformity to a type*, and need not mean more than "drawn up according to the teaching of." But it is certain that the Christians of the first four centuries who gave these titles to the Gospels meant more than this: they believed, and meant to express, that each Gospel was written by the person whose name it bears. They used this mode of expression, rather than the genitive case used of the Epistles, to intimate that *the same subject had been treated of by others;* and they often

emphasized the oneness of the subject by speaking of "the Gospel" rather than "the Gospels." This mode of expression is accurate; there is only one Gospel, "the Gospel of God" (Rom. 1:1) concerning His Son. But it has been given us in four shapes (εὐαγγέλιον τετράμορφον, Iren. III. xi. 8), and "according to" indicates the shape given to it by the writer named.

Let us apply to the case of Papias the distinction thus clearly and correctly drawn. Stripped of unwarranted inference and later strained interpretation the tradition which Papias reports contains nothing beyond the ordinary designation of the book. It was in his time, as now, "The Gospel according to Matthew." Papias takes the preposition "according to" in the strict sense common among his contemporaries.[3] Consequently he assumes the Greek gospel which he holds in his hands to be a translation, and supports his inference by a reference to the practice of "targuming." When he avers that "Matthew compiled (the force of the σύν in both variant readings συνέταξεν and συνέγραψεν should not be overlooked) the logia" he means the "commandments (ἐντολαί) delivered by the Lord" and recorded in Mt (*cf.* Mt 28:20). The brevity of the expression "the logia" is due to the fact that these same logia had been previously spoken of—were in fact part of the title of Papias' own book. He believes (mistakenly) that the compilation was the personal work of the Apostle Matthew, doubtless identifying this apostle (again mistakenly), as does the Gospel itself, with Levi the publican, son of Alphaeus.

But these strained interpretations and wrong inferences should not properly be charged to the account of the tradition itself as it was current in earlier days. Much has been, and continues to be imported into the ancient text whose only foundation is "the desire to connect Papias with the traditional Hebrew original of the Gospel of Mt." Antiquity also imported its own meanings into titles. What really remains to be accounted for is simply the title "Gospel according to Matthew," current in Papias' time as in ours. This is that "single root" we are in search of, for whatever it may convey. Neither the preposition "according to" nor the name "Matthew" stands superior to question. "According to," as we have seen, need not at first have been applied in the strict sense of personal authorship. "Matthew" is one of the commonest of Jewish names. As Origen already saw and as has been clearly shown in my *Expositor* article entitled "Why 'according to Matthew'?" the identification with Levi the publican, son of Alphaeus, is fallacious. There is nothing incredible in the understanding that some Greek-speaking Jewish convert of this name actually did compile and give his name to our first Gospel.

[3] The composer of the *Gospel according to* (κατά) *Peter* (130–140?) introduces Peter as speaking in the first person "I, Peter, and Andrew my brother."

The only incredible thing is that it should have been Matthew *the Apostle*. The tradition, then, is still in need of elucidation as respects both preposition and proper name. If there is further light to be had on this "single root" it must come from the unacknowledged employments before the days of Papias.

We turn, then, to Ignatius, admitted borrower from our first Gospel, and ask whether the amount and character of his unacknowledged employments shed any light upon the form and meaning of the tradition as it was in 115 A.D.

Actual mention of the name "Matthew" as authority for early statements derived from the Gospel is more than we can reasonably expect. Perhaps it is too much to expect that if Ignatius believed himself in possession of such an apostolic writing he would avail himself to larger extent of its record of the sayings and doings of Jesus, just as he avails himself of "commandments" of Paul with explicit reference to the Apostle's authority. The *amount* of Ignatius' quotation from Mt on the assumption that he took the preposition "according to" in the same strict sense as Papias, is certainly surprisingly small.

But no less surprising, on this same assumption, is the *character* of the dependence. By far the largest part of that which Ignatius takes from Mt is concerned with the story of the star seen by the Magi and the Virgin birth.[4] Surely if Ignatius took the apostolic authorship of Mt in a strict sense we should expect him to adhere somewhat closely to the canonical form of the birth story. Such, however, is by no means the case. He introduces a mass of legendary accretion, telling us how the "mystery wrought in the silence of God was made manifest to the aeons."

> A star shone forth in the heaven above all the stars; and its light was unutterable, and its strangeness caused amazement; and all the rest of the constellations with the sun and moon formed themselves into a chorus about the star; but the star itself far outshone them all; and there was perplexity to know whence came this strange appearance which was so unlike them. From that time forward every sorcery and every spell was dissolved, the ignorance of wickedness vanished away, the ancient kingdom was pulled down, when God appeared in the likeness of man unto newness of everlasting life.

But if we have no right to expect a convert from heathenism (as Ignatius seems to have been)[5] to abstain from a certain exuberant admixture of mythological fancy in his citations from the record of an Apostle, there is a further characteristic of Ignatius' gospel em-

[4] *Ad Eph.* xix.; *cf.* Mt 1:18–2:12.

[5] His surname θεοφόρος (*ad Eph.* i. 1) is more likely to have been acquired in pre-Christian days; *cf. ad Eph.* ix. 2.

ployments which on the theory of strict interpretation of the Matthean title appears stranger still. Ignatius, like Polycarp and Papias, is especially concerned to defend the crude doctrine of the "resurrection of the flesh"[6] against the "deniers of the resurrection and judgment." It is true that Mt's account of the resurrection appearances fails to emphasize this factor, which is clearly brought out in Lk 24:39 f.; but if Ignatius regarded Mt as in the strict sense apostolic it is surely strange that he should ignore entirely Mt's extended proofs of the disappearance of the body of Jesus in favor of a story which is not even Lk's, but derived, as Origen informs us, from *The Doctrine of Peter*. In his letter to the Smyrnaeans (iii. 2) Ignatius proves his point that Jesus "was in the flesh even after the resurrection" solely by the parallel to Lk 24:39 f. in this Petrine apocryphon:

> When he came to Peter and his company he said to them, Lay hold and handle me, and see that I am not a demon without body. And straightway they touched him and believed, having contact with his flesh and his blood.

The inference seems reasonable from the amount and character of Ignatius' quotations from Mt (a Gospel surely in his hands because of the reference in *Smyrn.* i. 1 to Mt 3:15), no less than from his disregard of it in favor of uncanonical report, that the Bishop of Antioch did *not* take the preposition κατά in its title in any such strict sense as Papias, though he would hardly do otherwise than employ the ordinary title if he had occasion to distinguish this Gospel from others.

On the other hand there is little to show, even in the earliest employments, whether the name "Matthew" was first superscribed by mistaken conjecture, or was actually the evangelist's real name which later readers took to mean the Apostle. This alternative will be considered in Chapter III. For the present we must limit ourselves to the unacknowledged employments.

We cannot subscribe to Streeter's unusually early dating for *Didaché*, but even were *Didaché* shown to have been current in the region of Antioch before 115, and to use by preference Mt as "the" Gospel, as Basilides and Marcion speak of Lk, no material addition to our knowledge would be gained. Streeter advances, indeed, a highly dubious theory in support of his doctrine of Antioch as the *birthplace* of Mt. He tells us (*FG*, pp. 500–507) that

> when Mt was written, the author, or committee of authors, who produced it aimed at producing a new and enlarged edition of Mk, that is to say, Mt was intended to supersede Mk; and in the Church of its origin it no doubt did so for a time, though later on Mk would be reintroduced (!)

[6] So in the "Apostles' Creed," τῆς σαρκός, not τοῦ σώματος.

as part of the Four Gospel canon accepted by the whole Church. Hence as soon as Mt was published the title "the Gospel" would naturally be transferred to it from Mk.

This theory of transfer and retransfer of title is contrary to known fact. The truth is Mk never did disappear. On the contrary its continued currency in all the great centers in spite of the superiorities of Mt and Lk is the very thing which made it unavoidable to adopt the distinguishing titles which all four now bear. No statement of the case could be better than Streeter's own (*FG*, p. 559):

> We are so used to the idea of there being four Gospels, known always by their authors' names, that we are apt to forget the earlier period when no church had more than one Gospel, and when this was commonly spoken of, not by its author's name, but simply as "*the* Gospel." But the moment two such works began to be current side by side in the same Church it became necessary to distinguish the Gospel "according to Mark" from that "according to Luke." Indeed, it is probably to the fortunate circumstance that Mk and Lk were so early in circulation side by side that we owe the preservation of the names of the real authors of these works.

Thus we are again recalled to the theory of the Antiochene *origin* of Mt, which Streeter seeks to reinforce by evidences of unacknowledged employments in the *Didaché*, maintaining for this probably North-Syrian church manual a date earlier than Ignatius.

It is probably true that Mt is more nearly "the" Gospel for *Didaché* than for Ignatius, whatever the relative date. This is quite what we should expect if *Didaché* were the later, because the progressive eclipse of Mk after the appearance of Lk, and still more after the appearance of Mt, is one of the most conspicuous and generally admitted phenomena of post-apostolic times. But passages found only in Mt are still quoted by Justin (142–150) as written in "the" gospel. The most, then, that can be inferred from the usage of *Didaché* is that the predominant use of Mt, so strikingly manifest in 120–150 A.D. had already begun.

Far more significant for its bearing on the beginnings of the Matthean tradition is the relation of our first Gospel to Lk. The two principal sources of each are the same, giving some color to the belief that both emanate from approximately the same region. Von Dobschütz, in a recent scholarly article,[7] even argues for a remote and indirect dependence of Mt on Lk from their opening chapters. For it is manifest that we do have here in both, in however discordant forms, the same alteration of Mk's "beginning of the gospel" by an epiphany of the heaven-born child, in the one case to "Magian" astrologers, in the other to shepherds; on the other hand the two

[7] "Matthaeus als Rabbi und Katechet," *ZNW*, XXVI, 3/4, 1928, pp. 338–348.

Gospels are not merely independent, but divergent to the point of irreconcilability. What Lk thinks of Magians may be gathered from his account of Simon of Gitta, the "gall-root of all bitterness" of Acts 8:23, or of Elymas the "Magian" at the court of Sergius Paulus, smitten by Paul as a "son of the devil and enemy of all righteousness." What Lk thinks of the Galilean tradition of the Resurrection, adopted by Mt to the complete exclusion of the Jerusalem tradition, may be gathered from the last chapter of his Gospel and the opening chapter of the Book of Acts. Stanton and Streeter agree in the conviction that these two Gospels are not only independent of one another, but that they must have seen the light at approximately the same date, since otherwise one would almost certainly show some degree of adjustment to the other. As respects closeness of date Stanton and Streeter are doubtless right; but what, then, of the question of provenance?

Canon Streeter holds (p. 533) that the fact that in Acts

> the connection of Peter with Antioch—the proudest boast of that Church—is completely ignored is fatal to the theory of some modern scholars that the book (Lk–Acts) was written in and for that Church.

He thinks, therefore, that the ancient tradition recorded by Eusebius and the Monarchian Prologue, that Luke was of Antiochian parentage, (Ἀντιοχεὺς τῷ γένει)[8] may either be set aside, or at least interpreted in a sense agreeable to that other group of modern scholars who maintain, contrary to the ancient tradition, that Lk-Acts was written in and for Rome; or to others still who would substitute Greece as the region of Luke's ultimate abode. But was not the connection of Peter with Rome the "proudest boast" of that church? And if the "complete ignoring" of it in the case of Antioch is fatal to the claims of Antioch to be the birthplace of Acts, how can the equally complete ignoring of it in the case of Rome be any less fatal to the claims of Rome? Surely we cannot say that the writer who makes Antioch the mother church of all Gentile Christianity *including Rome*, and mentions no other name in connection with the planting of Christianity at Rome save Paul, the Apostle of Antioch (Acts 13:1–3; 14:14), has allowed the claims of Rome to eclipse those of Antioch in his mind.

"Boeotia," of whose Christianization nothing is known, may serve the better for that reason as a neutral zone. Perhaps the bones of the beloved physician do still rest there in peace. But however this may be, the ancient tradition of Antiochian *parentage* for Luke is not so

[8] The β reading of Acts 11:28 "when *we* were gathered together" and late variants on "Lucius of Cyrene" in Acts 13:1 are probably not without relation to this second-century belief.

easily disposed of. Granted that the meaning is not that Antioch was the birthplace of the book, but only of its author, or even only that of Luke's parents, there must have been some reason for making the statement. And what other reason could be of interest to readers of the Book of Acts, save its perpetuation of Antiochian data? Among these were the claim that the Christians were first given this name at Antioch, that the group which launched it were the "prophets and teachers" who are enumerated by name in Acts 13:1–3 as leaders of this mother church of Gentile Christianity, and that the final settlement of the great dispute which for a time threatened to disrupt the entire brotherhood of believers was obtained on the instance of Antioch, which made representations on the matter to "the apostles and elders which were at Jerusalem"? Surely the tradition of Antiochian parentage for Lk has no little support from the internal evidence of his work.

But let it be supposed, for argument's sake, that the book Lk-Acts was actually written at Rome, or in Achaia. At all events its *traditions* were not gathered either in Greece or Italy. True, the earliest of all Lk's material, the so-called "We" document underlying Acts 15:35–28:31, might have been obtained at Rome. This second part of Acts constitutes an extension of the original story, the first part being mainly centered on Peter. It includes the further conquests of the gospel under Paul in the West, after the settlement of the great question of the times in the Apostolic Council. Second Acts (to adopt Torrey's convenient term) is Pauline and Greek from the bottom up, with only a superficial veneering from the hand of the editor. But whence does Lk derive the oriental narratives of First Acts? All this, from Lk 1:4 to Acts 12:25 with slight exceptions, is Petrine in point of view and Aramaic in sources and language-coloration. We are not now concerned with the minuter source-analysis of Lk-Acts, but by and large the statement will meet general approval that the main sources of First Acts are Petrine and Syrian. Many insist that it is possible to demonstrate that the entire mass Acts 1:1–15:34 is translated direct from Aramaic documents. But Aramaic documents certainly did not originate in Rome or in Greece. Moreover it is these which furnish the substructure. The Greek material, which centers upon Paul's later missionary career expanding the diary of some travel companion, however prior in date, is attached as supplement. Probably earliest of all Lk's sources in origin, it is obviously superimposed as the latest addition to his book.

Wherever, then, we place the final composition of Lk-Acts the dominant and basic sources of the writer are Petrine and Syrian, at least for the Gospel and I Acts. Taking these internal phenomena into consideration along with the ancient tradition we have a very strong

case for the origin at Antioch of at least *the type of gospel story* represented in Lk. 1:4–Acts 15:33.

How then account for the development *at the same place and approximately the same date* of a type of gospel story also Petrine and Syrian, but irreconcilable with Lk's in many important particulars? How, above all, will it be possible to maintain that "the author or committee of authors" who produced the anonymous Gospel of Mt toward the close of the century at Antioch were able completely to silence the claims *both* of Mk and the Antiochian-Petrine type of tradition current in that church to be "the Gospel"? What gave them power to set in circulation their own anonymous compilation as alone entitled to that exclusive claim? At Rome it is not surprising to find a later, fuller, better written story partially supplanting the cruder "Gospel according to Mk" under the distinctive title "Gospel according to Lk." This had already taken place before the Marcionite disruption in 140. But both Mk and Lk seem to have been in turn eclipsed at Rome by the still higher prestige of a gospel from the East claiming to be "according to Mt." That also is undisputed. Rome is a focus of dissemination for both. But it is something else, and far more improbable, that Streeter imagines as taking place at Antioch. We are asked to believe that in this ancient home of Jewish and Gentile Christianity, where at least the Gospel of Mk was already known and honored; also the writing known to modern critics as the Second Source; also the *Teaching of Peter* and (later) the *Gospel according to Peter;* besides such "narratives" (διηγήσεις) as Lk refers to in his preface and utilizes to make up much of his Gospel and the larger part of Acts 1–15, an author or committee of authors was able to introduce a new compilation *not* under the name of any apostle, but quite "anonymously," and that this work immediately leaped to such pre-eminence as to require no name at all to distinguish it from its predecessors, but became at once "the" Gospel *par éminence.* It was already such, we are told, "not later than A.D. 100" (!) to the author of the *Didaché.* Less than a score of years thereafter it was still such, it is claimed, to Ignatius.

How any author or committee of authors could accomplish this feat *without the aid of any ascription to an apostle* Canon Streeter does not explain. Neither does he offer any explanation how the false ascription came to be subsequently attached. If, however, we are willing to take Antioch not as the first but the *second* stage in the history of this Gospel's rapid advancement, holding that ascription to the Apostle Matthew (not necessarily in the narrower sense of later times) formed part of the appeal which gave it rapid ascendancy in the Church Catholic, difficulties will disappear. In our discussion of the two prefatory chapters of the Gospel, chapters prefixed to the

story of the public ministry as related by Mk, further reasons will be set forth for the belief already avowed, that the original birthplace of this compilation was among "the nations of the East," perhaps at Edessa, perhaps in the neighborhood of that community of Aramaic-speaking Jewish Christians eastward of Antioch at Aleppo (Beroea-Chalybis) known as Nazarenes. Its superimposed tincture of Aramaic tradition would thus be accounted for.

Streeter cites as "an infinitesimal point in favour of an Antiochene origin" for Mt that while the stater varied in weight and value in different districts "the commentators say that only in Antioch *and Damascus* (italics ours) did the official stater exactly equal two didrachmae, as is implied in Mt xvii. 24–27" (p. 504). Between Damascus, home of dissident Jewish sects in pre-Christian times, whose Christian community antedates even the conversion of Paul, and Edessa, capital of the first Christian kingdom, there was a whole realm of cultured Greek cities such as Apamea on the Orontes, where Greek-speaking Christian communities toward the close of the first century must have had relations on the one side with Antioch, on the other with the Nazarenes. For the origin of our anonymous first Gospel we must move backward along the line which its author traces as the approach of the Magi, guided by the miraculous star which led them "from the East" to Bethlehem. Among Greek-speaking Christians of Jewish descent in such a city as Apamea, or Edessa, where star-worship was the principal heathen cult, we might find an environment which would account for the peculiarities of Mt, whether as regards contents or traditional title and dissemination. At Antioch the only document we can imagine for one moment as having come into circulation anonymously under the simple designation "the" Gospel, is that precanonical source blended with Mk by both Mt and Lk which in the judgment of nearly all critics is at least older than any of our canonical Gospels, if not actually employed by Mk as well as Mt and Lk. This document S was almost certainly anonymous and non-apostolic. When used by Mt and Lk it was a Greek document, though bearing marks of translation from Aramaic. This writing, which furnishes the modern critic his best evidences for the teaching of Jesus under the artificial symbol Q, may well have circulated at Antioch before the adoption of the Gospels entitled "According to" Mk, Mt, or Lk as simply "the" Gospel. We are still at a loss to attach to it any author's name. Those who insist upon the exercise of historical imagination in this direction may apply to S the name of Philip "the evangelist" of Caesarea, the friend of Paul.

CHAPTER III

ASCRIPTION TO MATTHEW AND EARLY DISSEMINATION

THUS far we have not accounted for the most vital and important element of the whole tradition, the single clause "According to Matthew," which *as understood by men of the period of Papias* really involved all the rest. We are now driven to ask, even before we take up the problem of the Gospel's acceptance in Asia Minor and Rome: In what sense was this title originally intended; and how came it to be applied to an anonymous writing which does not purport to be from Matthew, and certainly was not the composition of any Apostle?

In my article written in 1900 for *The Expositor* (VIII, No. 118) entitled "Why 'According to Matthew'?" it was shown first (pp. 247–305) that the common assumption that the name "Matthew" was transferred to our canonical Gospel from some earlier, incorporated source known as "the Logia" is unfounded and improbable. Such was not the meaning of Papias, for neither he nor his contemporaries had the remotest suspicion of the existence of any other *Ur-Matthaeus* than simply the Greek Gospel in "Hebrew" dress. Nor can escape be found from this undeniable fact in the conjecture of a misunderstood utterance of "the Elder"; for Papias does not mention "the Elder" in this connection, nor does he give any reason to suppose he derives his statement regarding Mt from the "Elder." Had acquaintance with such an apostolic writing been evinced earlier students of Papias than nineteenth-century critics would have discovered the fact. Modern critics have indeed demonstrated the existence of a Second Source (S) independently employed by Mt and Lk to supply the deficiencies of Mk as regards teaching material. But the name "Matthew" cannot have been transferred from this forgotten source, because had it borne this name the Source would not have been forgotten.

The fact that S was not an apostolic writing, and did not bear the name of an Apostle, can be doubly proved. (1) The internal evidence of the Q material testifies convincingly that it was not, and did not purport to be, the writing of an Apostle or other eyewitness. On this ground even so ardent a supporter of the theory of an incorporated *Book of the Logia* as the veteran Godet would prefer to speak of

its author as "not *an* apostle, but the apostolate." Taking up this question on p. 217 of his *Introduction to the New Testament*, Vol. II (Engl. 1899), he gives his judgment as follows:

> As regards the *book of the Logia* I think that, properly speaking, the author was not a single individual. There was no single man, or even single apostle, to whose memory and intellect the composition of such a document could have been exclusively confided.

(2) Whatever we may think of this theory of joint authorship of S by "the apostolate," the external evidence of Lk 1:1–4 is fatal to any idea of its having been composed by Matthew or any other Apostle, or even by any official body of first-hand witnesses. Lk is explicit in distinguishing his own narrative, as well as those of certain predecessors on whose work he hopes to improve, from the testimony of the "eye-witnesses and ministers of the word." These had "delivered" it by word of mouth. Under the term "ministers of the word" Lk almost certainly means to include Mark, whom he describes as "minister" to Barnabas and Paul in Acts 13:5. The implication is that Mark's testimony, like that of the other "eye-witnesses and ministers" was *oral*. We must therefore infer that Lk understood the title "Gospel according to (κατά) Mk" in the sense "drawn up according to the teaching of"; for his employment of this writing is beyond dispute. It is not such, however, as we should expect him to accord to the first-hand written testimony of an eyewitness.

But Lk also uses in common with Mt the Second Source. In fact S is to him, and still more to Mt, distinctly "second" to Mk. Even as respects "order," which was regarded as early as "the Elder's" time as the weak point of Mk, both our canonical evangelists treat S as of inferior authority. Unless S is ignored altogether in his Preface Lk classes it among the "narratives" (διηγήσεις) drawn up by men of the second generation who received what they relate from "eye-witnesses and ministers of the word." It is therefore insupposable that either Mt or Lk can have regarded S as the work of an Apostle or eyewitness. Internal and external evidence taken together exclude absolutely the idea of Matthean authorship, reputed or real, for the Second Source of our Gospel. *A fortiori* the idea of a transfer of the title from source to incorporating work is excluded. S cannot have imparted what it did not possess.

Disproof of this form of attempted rescue for the tradition by a theory of transfer of the name from some nuclear source leaves us under all the greater obligation to account for the application of the title "According to Matthew" to the writing that has come down to us under that designation. In the *Expositor* article above mentioned an explanation was attempted. Its form was dictated by the challenge

of Zahn expressed as follows at the beginning of section 54 of his *Introduction* (Engl., Vol. II, p. 506):

> The tax-gatherer Levi must be identified with the Apostle Matthew . . . because there is *no conceivable reason* (italics ours) why a writer should identify the Apostle Matthew, in whom later he shows no particular interest, inasmuch as he is not mentioned again anywhere in his book, with a man of another name, the account of whose call in the other two reports which have come down to us is in no way connected with the apostles.

Zahn refers, of course, to the curious phenomenon of the text of Mk. 2:13–17 (=Mt 9:9–13=Lk 5:27–35), where the tax-gatherer Levi, son of Alphaeus, appears to be called as a fifth apostle after Andrew and Peter, James and John; and yet in the list of the Twelve, subjoined but a few verses below (Mk 3:13–19), Levi entirely fails to appear!

Lk at this point takes over Mk unaltered, corroborating the strange text as given by our best Ms. authorities. But the early, though arbitrary, Western text of Mk attempts a correction. Noting that a "*James* son of Alphaeus" appears in the list, of whom nothing further is said, it substitutes the name "James" for "Levi" in the story of the call, an obvious bit of harmonization which every textual critic must reject as secondary. Zahn agrees, of course, in rejecting this harmonization attempted by the β text of Mk 2:14; but he thinks the (probably) derived reading of Mt 9:9, which dismisses entirely "Levi son of Alphaeus" and substitutes "Matthew," should be taken to represent historical fact. My article gave reasons for holding that in reality Mt 9:9 is itself dependent on the Western reading adopted by the same writer in Mt 10:3. The real question is, Why do we find ὁ τελώνης attached after the name "Matthew" in Mt 10:3?

For "Levi son of Alphaeus" is not so easily dismissed. In my article it was pointed out (p. 307) that no example exists of two current Jewish names, such as Joseph and Simeon, or Levi and Matthew, being given to the same individual. It was also pointed out that even if an example could be found of such a substituted name we should expect mention of it by the evangelist, who reports the surnames of Peter, James, and John. This observation would seem to be fatal to Zahn's explanation of the Matthean substitution, an explanation commonly adopted by modern apologists for the tradition. Origen was certainly right in refusing the attempted identification and maintaining that Levi the publican was one individual, Matthew the Apostle another.[1]

My *Expositor* article undertook further to explain how the name "Matthew" came to be substituted for "James son of Alphaeus"

[1] *Ctr. Cels.* I, 62.

in Mt 9:9. The change is probably not arbitrary, but rests, as stated, upon the List of the Twelve adopted in Mt 10:2–4. This Matthean list at least differs widely from the Markan, if it be not actually taken from a separate source. However this may be, as now incorporated in Mt it has been adjusted to Mk by certain comments. Among these the words "the publican" (ὁ τελώνης) are inserted after the name "Matthew" in the form of a gloss. But, as often happens with explanatory glosses, its position is open to some question. If originally written on the margin it may well be simply a reflection of the well known and extremely early Western reading of Mk 2:14 just referred to. In that case it was not originally intended to attach to the name of "Matthew," but to that which immediately follows it, "*James* son of Alphaeus." In other words the gloss merely incorporates the "Western" variant of Mk 2:14.

With these conclusions the late Canon Stanton in a private letter to the writer expressed a disposition to agree. But he expressed dissent from the application of them to the origin of the title "According to Matthew." Objections from such a source cannot lightly be dismissed.

In answer to Zahn my article had offered it as a "conceivable" explanation that the remarkable difference between the Gospels as respects the call of the fifth apostle had been noted in antiquity, and that ancient scribes drew from it precisely the same inference which Zahn and the apologists for tradition draw today, viz., that the evangelist was as it were "whispering in the reader's ear: 'I am the real Levi of whom Mk relates this; I had two names, one Levi, the other Matthew.' " Zahn's assertion was that "there is no conceivable reason" save identity of the persons why the change should have been made in Mt 9:9 from "Levi son of Alphaeus" to "Matthew." Simply as an answer to Zahn the explanation offered should suffice. The equivalence Matthew=Levi is improbable if not impossible. Surnames, nicknames, and names drawn from another language offer no analogy. It is, therefore, "conceivable" that the title "According to Matthew" rests solely upon ancient conjecture making the same unwarranted inferences as modern apologetic. *Conceivably* the change in Mt 9:9 might have given rise to the theory of authorship.

But Stanton was justified in drawing a distinction between "origination" and "defense." The critic may well query whether conjecture would suffice to *originate* the tradition, however conducive to its *establishment* after promulgation on other grounds.

For this reason the question "Why according to Matthew"? must be regarded as still open. We cannot indeed any longer attach to the name "Matthew" any of the cherished inferences concerning occupation, and hence of qualification for his task as evangelist; for the

tax-gatherer's name was really "*Levi* son of Alphaeus," as both Mk and Lk attest, to say nothing of the corroborative testimony of the *Gospel according to Peter*. (Closing words of fragment.) Matthew and Levi are *not* identical, and the substitution in Mt 9:9 must be regarded as mere early harmonization, whether along the line above indicated or some other. This means that the name "Matthew" is for us simply a name and nothing more.[2] It is far from probable that it was ever attached in any sense to S. When originally attached to our first Gospel it may have referred to some primitive Jewish Christian, to us totally unknown, who bore this quite common Jewish name. Again, if it referred to the Apostle, this need not have been in the sense of individual authorship but, as Plummer suggests, in the sense "drawn up according to the teaching of." In that case we may imagine the existence of a tradition, since forgotten, of some activity of the seventh (Mt 10:3 *eighth*) apostle in the region whence this writing comes. Indeed some confirmation of this has been sought in the fact that late and dependent Aramaic gospels also make play with the name of "Matthew." But the dependence of the heretical gospels which make "Matthew" or "Matthias" their authority on our canonical Mt is so evident that no inference can be drawn from the fragments to support the idea that independent traditions existed at the time regarding evangelistic activities on the part of either apostle. Conjecture, and conjecture based upon the passage Mt 9:9, is the most probable source of the title. But the process was probably less direct than at first suggested. The transfer from Mt 9:9 to superscription was more roundabout, involving an outside factor. A parable from nature may illustrate.

The destructive insect which attacks the white pine passes the first stages of its life as a parasite upon the wild currant or gooseberry. Only at maturity is it conveyed to the stately pine. Just as the lowly shrub intervenes in the life-cycle of the pine-blister so may we trace the probable course of the pseudonym prefixed to Mt. Its origin must be sought primarily among the dependent heretical gospels which sprang into being early in the second century in answer to the sweeping conquests of Mk, Lk, and Mt. Full discussion of these postcanonical gospels, in so far as they are related to Mt must be reserved for an Appended Note (Note VI). But something may here be said regarding the Ebionite writing which among other designations applied to it by the orthodox was also known as "The Gospel according to Matthew," later writers explaining that it was not the authentic Mt, but "garbled and mutilated," as was indeed the fact. But let us again resort to analogy.

Among vivisectionists and educators the operation of headgrafting,

[2] See Wernle, *SF*, p. 229.

or transplanting of gray heads to green shoulders, has not as yet been attended with success. At least if, to use medical parlance, "the operation was a success" the patients failed to survive. However, among the restorers of antique statuary substitution for lost or damaged heads has often been effected with general satisfaction. Results would naturally be even more gratifying if the transfer affected only literary headings, which do not require the same nicety of adjustment. The question next to be considered is whether we have not sufficient evidence to warrant the belief that our canonical Mt has undergone such a process of caption transfer at an early date in its history. In fact there is some reason, as we shall see in Ch. IV, to believe that the operation did take place at Rome about 120 A.D. at the hands of a group of biblical experts. Of the two patients concerned the older and stronger survived, the younger and weaker succumbed to the process of decapitation.

These things are spoken in allegory. In reality councils never take the initiative, they either attempt to suppress or else make permanent through official endorsement some suggestion whose origin is traceable only to the elusive *on dit* of irresponsible popular belief. The alleged council *de recipiendis libris* at Rome in 120 A.D.,[3] if it really occurred, merely tipped the scales in favor of what was on the whole a true judgment. As between the two claimants, canonical Mt and the apokryphon which based its claim to be known as "According to Matthew" on a logion borrowed from Mt 9:9, canonical Mt was both the older and (from the doctrinal standpoint) the more deserving. But we must again turn to the situation as it stood in the age succeeding to that of the Synoptic writers.

The reference to "Matthias" as a *traditor* of gospel material ascribed by Hippolytus to Basilides (125–135) only serves to illustrate the tendency of the times to seek attachment for evangelic story to apostolic names. Much more to the point is the statement twice made by Irenaeus (*Haer.* I, xxvi. 2 and III, xi. 7), that the Ebionites, who "repudiate Paul, calling him an apostate from the Law," use as their only gospel "that which is According to Matthew." The statement probably rests on Justin, who in turn must have drawn from Palestinian authority, for neither Irenaeus nor Justin could personally have had knowledge of the obscure sect seated at Kokaba in Basanitis. It is repeated almost verbatim by Eusebius (*HE*, III, xxvii. 4) and naturally recurs with variations and attempted explanations in subsequent writers.

[3] In pre-Christian Rome such councils were no novelty. A board of fifteen members had custody over the sacred Sibylline books. In the reign of Tiberius the board and the Senate were reprimanded for admitting a writing to this canon on insufficient grounds.

But the intensely Jewish-christian, anti-Pauline sect of Ebionites certainly did *not* use our canonical Mt. Nor can their gospel have been *Ev. Naz.*, for the Nazarenes of North Syria were chiefly distinguished from the Ebionite Jewish-christians of South Syria just by their hearty endorsement of the mission work of Paul and their tolerant attitude toward Gentile Christians. For the Nazarenes admitted to fellowship those who did not, like themselves, observe the ritual precepts of Mosaism.[4] If the late and confused evidence of Epiphanius can be accepted this Ebionite gospel (which like other compositions intended to supply local needs would be known among the Ebionites themselves simply as "the" Gospel) was the same elsewhere called "the Gospel according to the Hebrews" (*Ev. Hebr.*).

Deferring other problems connected with it to Appended Note VI, the question to be raised here is only, Why was the Ebionite gospel also called both by Irenaeus (in two passages) and by others down to Theodoret of Cyrrhus, who either depends on Irenaeus or on the common source of both (*Haer. Fab.* II, i. *bis*), "The Gospel according to Matthew"? The answer to this question not only bears upon that of the nature and date of the so-called *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, but may also serve to explain the present difficulty regarding the application to the canonical Mt in the earlier decades of the second century of a name which certainly does not properly belong to it, yet which (in the judgment of well-qualified scholars) cannot have originated in direct conjecture from Mt 9:9 compared with Mk 2:14.

Epiphanius among the rest states distinctly that the Ebionite gospel, known to some as *Ev. Hebr.*, was called by others "The Gospel according to Matthew." He declares the work, however, to be not the true and authentic Mt, but "garbled" (*νενοθευμένον*) and "mutilated" (*ἠκρωτηριασμένον*). Others met the difficulty by postulating two kinds of Ebionite heretics, one branch using the authentic Mt, the other the spurious!

Epiphanius' charge is abundantly proved by the citations he makes from the work, showing the writing from which his extracts are made to belong to the class which we may designate as "*synoptica*" by distinction from the famous "*Diatessaron*" of Tatian. For Tatian's work, dating from 160 to 170, was a mosaic of the four canonical Gospels ingeniously dovetailed together. But Tatian's was not the first composite gospel. It had been preceded by certain secondary products of the oriental method of book-making by amalgamation. These composites blended together two or more of our Synoptic Gospels in various heretical interests. Indeed our own Gospels of Mt and Lk are themselves products of this same time-honored method

[4] *Cf.* Justin, *Dial*, xlvii. on tolerant (Nazarene) vs. intolerant (Ebionite) Jewish Christians.

of amalgamation, since both consist of a combination of Mk with a Second Source (S). In both Mk is basic, this outline together with SQ supplying the mass of the book while the evangelists themselves each add a small amount of other material (P), though Mt's supplements are greatly inferior both quantitatively and qualitatively to Lk's.

Of these "synoptica" of the period before the *Diatessaron* the best extant example is the *Gospel according to Peter*, still used at the close of the second century in the church in Rhossus near Antioch. *Ev. Petr.* combined Mt with Mk and Lk, adding traces from other gospels, but was excluded from church use by Serapion the metropolitan bishop about 195 A.D., on account of certain traits indicative of docetic heresy. A large fragment, covering the whole passion narrative and ending with the opening sentences of a resurrection story probably based on the lost ending of Mk, was recovered in 1887 from a tomb in Akhmim.

But we must return to Epiphanius and his "garbled and mutilated" Mt which the extracts clearly show to have been a "synopticon" of the type of *Ev. Petr.*, but far less innocent. The following extract will show that it actually did bear toward Mt a relation similar to that of Marcion's gospel to the authentic Lk. (*Panar.* XXX, 13):

> There was a certain man named Jesus, he was about thirty years old, who made choice of us. And he came down to Capernaum and entered into the house of Simon surnamed Peter. And he opened his mouth and said: Passing along by the Sea of Tiberias I chose for myself John and James the sons of Zebedee, and Simon and Andrew [5] and Thaddeus and Simon the Zealot and Judas Iscariot; *and thee Matthew, sitting at the toll-booth, I called and thou didst follow me.* I therefore intend you to be twelve apostles as a testimony to Israel.

After this followed an account of the baptism of Jesus by John related in the Synoptic form and language, but with certain sectarian peculiarities.

Clearly, from its beginning (always the source of book designations in Semitic practice) this writing, whatever its nature, would inevitably be designated, wherever it came into comparison with other gospels, either "Gospel according to the Twelve Apostles," or (since Matthew is specially selected to play a distinctive part, probably connected with his ability as tax-collector to handle the pen) "Gospel according to Matthew." From the limited group of Jewish Christians among whom it circulated in Transjordan and near the Dead Sea it would

[5] Two pairs of names from the "twelve" appear to have fallen out at this point in transcription.

naturally be known to the Christians of northern Egypt as "The Gospel according to the Hebrews," for a provincial gospel of Gnostic type, also Greek, was distinguished from the Ebionite writing by the designation "The Gospel according to the Egyptians."

We must defer for consideration in an Appended Note (No. VI) the question whether (and if so when and from whom) this Ebionite second-century apokryphon received the appellation "Gospel according to Matthew." Certainly this could only occur at a very early date, not later than the second decade of the second century. Moreover the appellation cannot have been given by the Ebionites themselves to their gospel; for it is explicitly stated in repeated references that the community in question tolerated no other. To them, consequently, the writing would be known simply as "the" Gospel. Again, no outsider acquainted with the canonical Mt, *if this latter then bore the name*, would have dreamed of applying to the crude heretical amalgam the same name already attached to the much more highly esteemed and earlier Gospel from which it obviously draws much of its material. Why, then, should the name "Gospel according to Matthew" have been applied to the Ebionite writing? Two alternatives appear equally inadmissible. We may dismiss as erroneous all the testimony, including the two passages from Irenaeus, which declares that this designation *was* applied to it, or we may hold that the Ebionites themselves, abandoning their exclusive attitude toward the canonical Gospels, changed their mode of reference, and instead of speaking of their gospel as "the" gospel, began to give it a designation which however apostolic made the work nevertheless only one of several. The extreme improbability that the Ebionites themselves are responsible for the designation "according to Matthew" will be apparent.

Let it be assumed, then, for the argument's sake, that Irenaeus and the second-century informants on whom he depends (for Irenaeus personally can have had no knowledge of the Ebionites) were quite in error, and that the designation "according to Matthew" was not applied by anyone to the Ebionite composite. In that case we at least have a conspicuous example of precisely that kind of conjecture for which Stanton maintained there was no evidence. For it is quite evident from the fragment above-cited, (be the work a second- or a fourth-century product), that *the compiler of Ev. Hebr. is using Mt 9:9 with the purpose of suggesting that the Apostle Matthew whom Jesus had called from the collection of taxes could and did serve the appointed body of the Twelve as the recorder of their "testimony to Israel."* The Ebionite compiler himself doubtless wished and expected his work to be called "the" Gospel. But he also manifestly wished it to be understood that its contents had been committed by Jesus personally

to the Twelve, with special designation of "Matthew" as their qualified scribe and recorder. Readers not of the Ebionite circle, *and not acquainted with any other gospel claiming this name*, would inevitably ascribe its (reputed) authorship to the Apostle Matthew.

On the other hand the assumption of error on the part of Irenaeus, while it avoids the immediate difficulty, does so only at the cost of involving us in new perplexity. We shall still be under obligation to find a primitive reporter of Ebionism so ignorant of the facts as to suppose that these bitterly reactionary and intensely anti-Pauline heretics used as their only gospel our canonical Mt, rejecting all others.

Consider, then, a further alternative. At some period so early that our canonical Mt had not yet become generally known by its present title, but still late enough to be used along with Lk by the Ebionite compiler, unknown persons who read this paragraph of the heretical composite took the writer at his word, so far as finding a distinctive name for the writing was concerned. It was called "according to Matthew" just as the Gospels of Judas Thomas and others were called by the names of particular apostles, without necessary acknowledgment of their authenticity. Previous to the unwarranted claims of canonical Mt to this title (claims not even suggested by any part of its contents) it may well have been sometimes conferred upon the Ebionite composite which did purport to be written by Matthew in fulfilment of the intention of Jesus himself. Of course neither canonical nor uncanonical gospel has any historical claim to the name, nor is Matthew any more likely than Bartholomew or Thomas to have had skill with the pen. However, so far as priority of conjecture is concerned as between Mt and *Ev. Eb.* it can only be awarded to the Ebionite composition, dependent as it is. The title fits here, and can be completely accounted for by the writer's use of Mt 9:9. It does not in the least fit the canonical writing, and can only have been taken over from some other. If the process of transfer can be dated late enough to allow for dissemination of the rumor that the Ebionites possessed a gospel purporting to have been written by the Apostle Matthew the transfer is easily explained. On this question we refer to Appended Note VI.

The outcome of our search for residual truth in the tradition of Matthean authorship is meagre. It is indeed certain that the title "According to Matthew" was not at first attached to this Gospel. Neither did it come to it from S, which certainly did not possess it. In the next chapter an attempt will be made to determine somewhat more closely when and how the transfer may have been made permanently effective.

Let us turn meantime from the difficult problem of the origin of

the title to the momentous consequences entailed. For to the title, affixed to Mt at some period probably later than Ignatius, we must largely ascribe the triumphal march of this relatively late and Jewish-christian Gospel across the whole mission field of Paul from Antioch to Rome, a conquest which made Mt within a half-century after we can first positively identify it in church use, the dominant and preferred authority throughout the Greek-speaking Christian world. This advance over the ground evangelized by Paul is a phenomenon of much more than academic interest. Significant for the history of the development of Christianity in this obscure post-apostolic age it is of even greater concern in practical application. For the reaction which it connotes from the inspired insight and freedom of Paul toward post-apostolic neo-legalism has left its impress on the Church catholic down to the present day. Of this reaction the growing influence of Mt was perhaps more a symptom than a cause. Yet the predominance this neo-legalistic gospel so quickly attained has not been without lasting effect in swerving nascent Christianity back toward the spirit, beliefs, and institutions of the Synagogue.

The long struggle against Gnostic heresy, the "acute Hellenization of Christianity," as Harnack calls it, was already beginning. To our evangelist, as to his contemporary, Jude, it takes the form of a battle against "lawlessness" (*ἀνομία*), a battle for the commandments "once for all delivered to the saints." Perhaps the course of events admitted no such alternative as a justly proportioned Hellenization, but compelled a choice between Gnostic theosophy and a reversion toward Judaism disguised under Christian forms. If so, doubtless it was better that the Church catholic should become neo-legalistic and apocalyptic, rather than antinomian and theosophic. Our evangelist fulminates against the hypocrisy of "scribes and Pharisees," but the "righteousness" which he commends is little more than that of scribes and Pharisees raised to a higher scale. His conception of the teaching of Jesus is a Torah of Moses made over in preparation for the messianic age about to dawn. His ideal evangelist is a "scribe who hath been made a disciple to the kingdom of heaven," who brings out of his treasury of teachings "things old and new." Mt's idea of a gospel of world-redemption is "the law and the prophets" of former generations plus the new commandment of Jesus. His apostolic commission is the task of teaching all men everywhere to obey it.[6]

The danger of "acute Hellenization," or "lawlessness," was averted; but at the cost of surrender of much of the ground which Jesus and Paul had won from Synagogue biblicism. The wild and

[6] *Cf.* the article of von Dobschütz above referred to (*ZNW*, XXVII, 3/4) "Matthäus als Rabbi and Katechet."

fantastic protest of Marcion produced only disruption. It made real appreciation of Paul harder rather than easier for a Church-catholic bent on ecclesiastical organization and authority. Thus for fifty years Greek Christianity, outwardly bitter in its opposition to Judaism, imbibed inwardly its spirit, and copied its beliefs and institutions.

To follow the spread of our first Gospel, well fitted as it was to the demands of the times and supported by an ill founded, but undisputed and unrivalled claim to apostolic authority, is to gain new insight into that complex of movements and influences which have made the historic faith what it is. From the eastern border of Greek-speaking Christianity, the region nearest in contact with Judaism, whether as respects outward polemic or latent affinity, it followed the footsteps of Paul to Greece and Rome. Within a decade or so after Ignatius' journey from Antioch through Asia Minor to his martyrdom in Rome we find it advancing in all quarters toward a position of unrivalled primacy. Only by slow degrees, toward the close of the second century, does the fourth Gospel attain in some regions to similar standing, this too only after a period of opposition so intense as to lead some in the Church to reject the entire body of writings ascribed to John.

Even after Irenaeus had made acceptance of the "Fourfold Gospel" (εὐαγγέλιον τετράμορφον) the touchstone of orthodoxy, any other position for Mt than at the head of the group is highly exceptional, and the exception appears to be based on doctrinal valuation rather than any question of Mt's claim to be first in order of date. Moffatt (*Introd.*, p. 14) lists seven different arrangements of the Gospels found in manuscripts or implied in patristic references. In only two of these does Mt take any other place than first, and in these two it is preceded only by Jn. The Coptic versions have an order logically commendable in that it does not break the connection between Lk and Acts but places the Gospels in the order Jn, Mt, Mk, Lk. Chrysostom and minuscule 19 have the order Jn, Mt, Lk, Mk, an order according to valuation. Irenaeus, who in point of date places Mt first, has an order Jn, Lk, Mt, Mk in *Haer.* III, xi. 8, to agree with his idea of the symbolism of the four living creatures of Rev. 4:7. But these orders giving precedence to Jn are highly exceptional and can usually be accounted for. In general the common order of today, the official Roman order of the *Muratorianum* (*c.* 185) reflects the feeling and practice of the second century. Papias (*pace* Streeter) is anything but an exception to the general rule from his time to the end of the century. It is scarcely too much to say of the common practice in Papias' time that Mt is *always* the Gospel employed, unless the particular quotation wanted is not to be found

in it. Even on the moot point of "order" the same holds true. Critics who ask us to believe that Papias is using Jn (!) as a standard when criticizing the order of Mk (he is really defending Mk against the imputation of "the Elder") confuse the issues of 140 A.D. with those of 190. It is certainly the order of Mt, which (however artificial and incorrect from the point of view of modern criticism) was regarded by Papias as the order of an apostolic eyewitness. It is this which was made the standard by early harmonists.[7] Stanton's well-considered judgment (*GHD*, I, p. 276) that "In the case of our first Gospel the signs of early use are specially abundant" is easily within the demonstrable facts.

[7] So Ammonius (*cf.* Zahn, *Introd.*, sec. 50, p. 420) and Tatian.

CHAPTER IV

STEPS TOWARD CANONIZATION

We have already observed (p. 47) as "one of the most striking phenomena of 120–150 A.D." the rapid advance of Mt toward an undisputed predominance in the slowly forming canon of the four Gospels. Its intrinsic adaptation to the special needs of the Church catholic in this period of struggle against "acute Hellenization" accompanied by dangerous moral laxity, most of all the bold claims made on its behalf to apostolic authority, go far to explain this advance, apart from any special evidences accessible to modern enquiry of particular stages in the process.

Nevertheless two data of significance survive which are worthy of special notice for their bearing on probable steps in this process of quasi-canonization, before passing on to inferences deducible from the text itself. The first of these is a curious group of synchronisms attached to a fifth-century Syriac document concerned with the controversy in which Epiphanius had borne a conspicuous part regarding the Perpetual Virginity of Mary. The other is a quotation from Claudius Apollinaris, successor to Papias in the see of Hierapolis in Phrygia, dealing with the so-called Paschal controversy, a fragment preserved in the *Paschal Chronicle* which mentions "Matthew" by name as an apostolic and authoritative writing, and implies a method (not clearly defined in the fragment) by which Apollinaris felt able to harmonize what to some members of his flock appeared (and to moderns still appear) the conflicting statements of "Matthew" with some other Gospel not named. This other of course, can only be the fourth, our Gospel of Jn.

Both of these items are significant of the advancing claims of Mt to paramount authority; but their bearing on the case requires further elucidation, especially as regards the Syriac synchronisms, which can only be brought into relation with our canonical Mt on the supposition that the Syriac writer drew them from some record no longer extant; for as he employs them they apply only to the late legend he advances in support of his fifth-century contention that Mary remained a virgin to her death.

In my *Introduction to the New Testament* (1900, p. 38) reference is made to this Syriac manuscript, published with translation in the *Journal of Sacred Literature* for Oct., 1866, by W. Wright, as well as

to the discussion of its significance by Hilgenfeld ("Das kanonische Matthaeusevangelium" in *ZWTh* for 1895, p. 449). My more recent article "Toward the Canonization of Matthew" in the *HThR* for April, 1929 (XXII, pp. 151–171), gives the results of more complete and careful studies. The nature and purpose of the manuscript are shown in its title: "As to the Star: showing how and by what means the Magi knew the Star, and that Joseph did not take Mary as his wife." An extract from my *Introduction* will show the bearing on our present enquiry of a section forming its close.

> The visit of the Magi to Bethlehem (Mt 2:1–13) is declared to have been "In the [three hundred] and eleventh year (Seleucid era = 1 B.C.) in the second year of our Redeemer" (*cf.* Mt 2:16). The incident itself is declared to have been authenticated by a council assembled for the purpose in Rome "in the year 430 (= 119 A.D.), under the reign of Hadrianus Cæsar, in the consulship of Severus and Fulgus, and the episcopate of Xystus (Sixtus I), bishop of the city of Rome."

Other critics, including Nestle and Zahn (*Introd.* § 54, p. 527), had not failed to call attention to the fact that dating by synchronisms with this degree of exactitude is quite beyond the unaided powers of a Syriac scribe of the fifth or sixth century, and that his datings at least must have been derived from some older source, perhaps one which recorded an actual council at Rome held at the date specified for the purpose of passing on the assertions of Mt 2, so novel to readers of the Roman Gospel of Mk.

Zahn, in particular, is emphatic on this point:

> The exactness of the fourfold dating is surprising. If we change the first figure 430 to 431 (Oct. 1, 119–120 A.D.), all four dates agree, a great rarity in chronological notices of this sort. In the year 120, then, and primarily in Rome, as the manner of dating shows, the question in what year the Magi had come to Bethlehem was actively discussed. We are reminded of discussions like those concerning the census of Quirinius and of the fictitious *Acts of Pilate* (Justin, *Apol.* i. 34, 35). If there is anything in this remarkable statement, then in 120, in Rome and "in various places," men were occupied in a scholarly fashion with Mt ii., that is, of course, with the Greek text of this chapter of our Mt.

We may add that the consistency of dates in the fragment extends over a fifth not counted by Zahn. For it begins with a reference to the nativity as occurring in the year (three hundred) "and eleven." The equivalent of this date of the Seleucid Era, used in Edessa at the period of our document, is 2 B.C. The datings are all taken consistently from the fifth-century *Consularia Constantinopolitana*, as can be easily proved by slight errors of text such as the spelling of the names of the consuls. The question still remains, however, from

what source, or sources, a Syriac writer of the fifth century could have hit upon the device of a council of "great men in various places acquainted with the Holy Scriptures," assembled *at Rome* to pass upon the authenticity of a book, and recording their decision in writing "in their own language." Had the affirmation been framed originally in support of our author's own composition we should expect not only errors in the synchronisms, but reference to the language and authorities of his own country.

Earlier scholars such as Nestle, Hilgenfeld, Zahn, and Harnack, have hesitated to treat this Syriac fragment as embodying the record of an actual council, a council *de recipiendis libris*, held at Rome in 120 A.D. to pass upon the claims of our Gospel of Mt. But hesitation is abandoned and the plunge taken by Streeter in his recent volume (*FG*, 1925, p. 525). Speaking of the opinion of "Harnack and others" that the dating used by the Syriac writer is authentic Streeter adds:

> I hazard the conjecture that it is the date of a conference at which the Roman Church accepted the First Gospel as Apostolic on the testimony of representatives of the Church of Antioch. The martyrdom of Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, in the Coliseum was then an event of recent memory. His letter to the Roman Church, which became, as Lightfoot shows, a kind of martyr's handbook, had attracted great attention; his enthusiastic admiration of the Roman Church, his emphasis on ecclesiastical discipline, based on obedience to the Bishop as a safeguard against heresy, would have specially commended the Church of Antioch and its traditions to the consideration of the authorities at Rome. Once a favourable hearing was secured for the tradition of Apostolic authorship, the Gospel on its merits would seem worthy of an Apostle. At any rate by the time of Justin Martyr, the Gospel of Mt, alongside that of Mk and Lk, is firmly established as one of the accepted Gospels of the Roman Church.

Without further tracing back of the Syriac synchronisms to their actual source, or at least the indication of some line of transmission by which they might naturally reach a sixth-century writer in Edessa, the conjecture, however attractive, must indeed be classed as "hazardous." Such a tracing back I have endeavored to give in the article referred to above under the title "As to the Canonization of Matthew." The Syriac writer, as already stated, draws his dates from the *Consularia Constantinopolitana*, the latest date-book of his time. But the date-book was not his only source, much less the inspiration of his work. His impulse comes through Epiphanius, whose treatise on the Perpetual Virginity of Mary had been translated into Syriac not long before our document was composed. This appears from his title, curiously attaching an argument on the Perpetual Virginity to a seemingly unrelated discussion of the Magi and the Star. He also knows (as we should naturally infer from the false ascription of his

material) the *Church History* of Eusebius, translated into Syriac before 400 A.D., if not the *Chronicon* also. These writings would of course inform him, if not already informed, of the two great contemporary chronographers of the third century, Hippolytus of Rome and Africanus of Emmaus-Nicopolis in Palestine. Even if the writer were not directly acquainted with either of these (and such acquaintance is unlikely) the contents of his work show its general derivation. It consists of an attempt to trace the visit of the Magi to its Persian origin in a tradition transmitted from Balaam's prophecy of the Star through successive reigns synchronized with the Old Testament kings. Attached at the end is the proof (?) that Mary lived in her own house in Nazareth, apart from Joseph. Most of this supplemental demonstration has been purposely excised by some owner of the Ms., leaving only the appended synchronisms. The earlier portion, dealing solely with the question "How the Magi knew the Star," shows that its author relied upon some one of the numerous World-chronicles, or attempts to bring all the events of world history into adjustment with the Bible. These were based upon Hippolytus in the West, but more reliance was placed on Africanus in the East. The datings of our Syriac writer favor, as we should expect, Africanus rather than Hippolytus; but his dependence is probably indirect. Pseudo-Africanus, or that form of the World-chronicle which included an apocryphal story of the Magi as despatched by the king of Persia "the star showing them the way" is perhaps the middle link.

Now Epiphanius, writing his long chapter on the Alogi and other deniers of Gospel agreement in Cyprus *c.* 375 A.D., begins his demonstration of their exact harmony by a reconciliation of the apparent discrepancy between the early chapters of Mt and Lk, following the lines of Africanus' famous theory of the two genealogies of Joseph, the husband of Mary. He brings it to a close with a much more elaborate reconciliation of the fourth Gospel with the Synoptics along the lines of Hippolytus' no less famous defense of this Gospel against the Alogi, one of whose principal objections was the conflict between Jn and the Synoptics in point of chronology. Epiphanius therefore transcribes (with conjectural modifications of his own) the entire section of the Hippolytean consular lists covering the "thirty years" required by Lk 3:23 between Jesus' birth and baptism. Epiphanius' corrections then come to be adopted in the *Consularia Constantinopolitana*, and so are passed on to our Edessene writer, to the *Chronicon Paschale*, and to others.

But the World-chronicles founded on the chronographies of Africanus and Hippolytus did not lose sight of the harmonistic interests of their inspirers. The date of the Nativity was accompanied by a note referring to the visit of the Magi, and that of the consulship of

the two Gemini with similar reference to the crucifixion and ascension. Particularly the successions of the Persian kings from Balaam to the visit of the Magi offered a favorite method for the authentication of Mt.

It would be difficult today to identify the particular World-chronicle which links our Syriac writer to Africanus, whose datings he generally adopts. His lists of Persian kings, however, could undoubtedly be carried back, if necessary, to some such third- or fourth-century thesaurus.[1] With his Roman material better headway can be made. He is certainly dependent on Epiphanius, and Epiphanius, as is well known, rests chiefly on Hippolytus, especially in this particular division of the *Panarion*. As respects Hippolytus' refutation of those who objected to the fourth Gospel because its chronology conflicted with the Synoptic we know something. Hippolytus' chief opponent was the "learned" Gaius, Bishop of Portus. This controversy took place in the period of Irenaeus, who makes clear reference to it, writing *c.* 186. The *Muratorian Canon* embodies the decisions of the Roman church on the books permitted and forbidden to be read from its pulpits. But had not Rome taken action similar to that implied in the *Muratorianum* when previously called upon to decide between similar conflicting claims? Its home-Gospel of Mk offered a very different "beginning" from that of the new-comer Mt, a gospel introduced not long before the coming of Ignatius, and certainly brought into great prominence by his use of it. For it is just the item of the Magi and the Star which chiefly interests Ignatius, and is at the same time that in which Mt stands most conspicuously out of line with Mk. If a "conference" was held at Rome in 120 A.D. to settle this question, is it likely that the memory of its date and its decisions survived until the time of Hippolytus, so that reference could be made to it in his *Chronology*, and thus pass on into the World-chronicles on which our Syriac writer depends? Two things are favorable to the idea that such was actually the case.

(1) We have already noted that the interest of Hippolytus in chronography is apologetic. He aims at harmonization of the Gospels. Africanus and the β text of the Genealogy in Lk give abundant proof that the discrepancy between Mt and Lk had by no means been overlooked in the second century. Porphyry is one of those who threw scorn upon it. Epiphanius does well to start his chronological defense with this. Probably those from whom he so freely draws, Hippolytus included, had not been silent on the subject.

(2) Councils *de recipiendis libris* were no new thing at Rome in

[1] See Bratke (*TU*, N. F. IV, 3, pp. 130 and 172) on Jewish and Christian Apocrypha connecting Persian and Magian astrology with the star of Balaam. *Cf.* also Origen, *Ctr. Cels.* I, 60.

Hippolytus' time and before it. They were really pre-Christian in origin, as already observed (above, p. 42, note). Our most conspicuous Christian example is the *Muratorian Canon,* which, as Harnack has recently pointed out, represents not the opinion of any single individual (the author speaks of what "we" and "the Church catholic" receive), but the decision of some representative and authoritative body. But even the *Muratorianum* is not all. Tertullian has further implications. True, he *may* be using some of his not unaccustomed hyperbolic diction; he *may* be referring to councils held after that which gives us the *Muratorianum;* but his language in protesting against the public reading of *The Shepherd* of Hermas implies more than the condemnation imposed on the book by the *Muratorianum.* Tertullian writes in the *De Pudicitia,* addressing the Bishop of Rome, "By *every* assembly of your churches" this writing has been rejected. Moreover he is speaking not of general councils, but provincial, Italian "conferences," in which the African churches had not joined. To how much earlier a date than the first protests against the public reading of Hermas (154 A.D. ?) this practice of holding local councils *de recipiendis libris* can be carried back in the Roman church we can only conjecture. Still there is nothing improbable in the supposition advanced by Streeter that such a "conference" took place not long after the coming of Ignatius; nor is it insupposable that Hippolytus or Africanus, impelled by their apologetic and harmonistic interest, may have somewhere preserved the memory and date of the favorable decision. What the *Muratorianum* itself had to say regarding the canonicity of its "first" Gospel is unfortunately missing.

Further support for the belief that such a local council was actually held at Rome in 120 A.D. may be found in what we know to have taken place in Phrygia not more than a generation later. We have already seen that Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis in 140 A.D., makes our Gospel of Mt his principal authority, accepting without question, and in the strictest sense, the title which ascribed it to the Apostle Matthew. On the other hand Papias is certainly acquainted with First Jn and almost certainly with the fourth Gospel, though he gives no sign of ascribing to either of these any apostolic authority. Only the Revelation, which explicitly and boldly claims the name of the Apostle (Rev. 1:9–11) is ardently defended in this claim by Papias as well as by all the later succession of Chiliasts who take their cue from him.[2] If Papias had given to the fourth Gospel even such indirect and secondary authority as he claims for the second Gospel because of its author's relation to Peter, his testimony in its behalf would certainly have been quoted on one side or the other of the controversy which raged a generation later over the admissibility of the Johannine

[2] See Appended Note III.

canon; for western conservatives objected that the fourth Gospel conflicted with the accepted three, whereas the "Phrygians" defended it. A leading feature of the dispute was the conflict in chronology, particularly where ritual practice was involved, as in the differing date for the observance of Easter.

In this celebrated "Paschal controversy" the "Phrygians" must of course have had some standard method of harmonizing the Johannine date with the Synoptic, or Matthean; for in 150–180 Mt, rather than Mk or Lk, was naturally appealed to by both sides as of "apostolic" authority. Exactly how the feat of harmonization was accomplished we are not told, though it was probably along the same lines followed by Clement of Alexandria in his contribution to the controversy, viz., the theory that the Passover supper of Mt. 26:17 ff. was eaten by Jesus and the twelve a day earlier than the official date. However, our interest in the subject is not with Clement, early in the third century, but with Claudius Apollinaris, the successor of Papias at Hierapolis about 160. For the beginning of the controversy was earlier still, our first information coming through the mission of the aged Polycarp to Rome *c.* 150, when he was permitted by the Roman bishop Anicetus to celebrate the annual feast after his own fashion, Roman observance notwithstanding. This exercise of Christian toleration unfortunately did not prevent a fresh outbreak in Laodicea, three miles across the river Meander from Hierapolis, shortly after the death of Papias. To this second outbreak Claudius Apollinaris makes his contribution in a fragment preserved in the *Paschal Chronicle* side by side with that from Clement, showing incidentally how the acceptance of "Matthew" as authoritative had produced a clash in the diocese over the question of the proper date for observance of Easter. Apollinaris wrote as follows:

> Some there are, however, who because of ignorance raise dispute about these things, being afflicted after a well known manner; for ignorance does not merit denunciation but calls for instruction. Now these men say that the Lord ate the lamb with his disciples on the fourteenth (Nisan), but that on the great day of Unleavened Bread he himself suffered; and they declare that Matthew affirms the matter to be in accordance with their opinion; so that their doctrine is contrary to the Law (Ex. 12:17 ff.) and brings the Gospels into apparent conflict.

In Asia Minor the mode of observance of Easter had been from "the times of the Apostles" Quartodeciman, that is, in accordance with the fourth Gospel. Polycarp, as we have seen, bore witness to this in a journey to Rome at the age of eighty or more. Consequently those anti-quartodeciman members of his diocese whom Apollinaris treats so contemptuously for their alleged "ignorance," are the in-

novators. They maintain that "Matthew," the Gospel which Apollinaris' predecessor Papias had given such unique authority, demands the Roman and not the Phrygian, or Asiatic, mode of observance. A little "instruction," their Bishop declares, would have shown them two things: first that the Mosaic law really requires observance on the fourteenth, as the Jews maintain, not the fifteenth; second that conflict between the holy Gospels is unthinkable.

The point which interests us is not what particular mode of misinterpretation the Bishop applied to Mt to make it agree with Jn, but the implication of the controversy itself. For if the supporters of "Matthew," are the innovators (and these, we know, do not misinterpret Mt, but take it in its real and unperverted sense), and if the harmonizing misinterpretation of the Bishop had to be invented in order to accommodate the more recently received Gospel of Mt to Phrygian festal observance, then the arrival of the Gospel of Mt in Phrygia must have been comparatively recent in Papias' day, for the indigenous tradition was certainly Johannine. Papias would hardly have ventured to change the mode of observance practiced throughout Proconsular Asia "since the times of the Apostles." Hence in adopting Mt he was surely unconscious of the conflict, a condition which in the nature of the case could not long endure. For when Polycarp went to Rome, probably for the very purpose of bearing his testimony in the controversy, the discrepancy could not remain hid. The dispute once raised—say in 150 A.D.—the bishops responsible for the adoption of Mt would naturally find at once a method of harmonization. But naturally also not all the flock could be immediately "instructed." Those who accepted Mt but still remained "ignorant" were for disregarding the Johannine chronology and coming to agreement with Rome. If "quarrelsome" they remained unconvinced by their bishop's explanation of the "apparent conflict." Of course the generality of believers in Phrygia continued their Quartodeciman observance as before. Two centuries were to elapse before agreement was reached between East and West.

The fact that the Gospel of Mt, distinctly mentioned as "Matthew's" by both Papias and Apollinaris, is thus involved in the earlier stages of the long Easter controversy enables us to determine something regarding its spread. Incidentally we observe how impossible it would be for this unquestionably Syrian Gospel to take a place at Rome alongside of the indigenous Gospel of Mk and the Antiochian (?) Gospel of Lk without some action of church officials corresponding to that implied in the *Paschal Treatise* of Apollinaris. At Rome there would be no conflict on the score of Easter observance, because Mt follows Markan, that is, Roman, observance. But there would be inevitable conflict at Rome as regards the adoptionist *beginning* of

Mk. The story of the Star and the Magi involves an Epiphany at birth difficult to reconcile with the Epiphany by vision and voice from heaven at the Baptism of John. Cerinthus may not have brought his protest to bear until a later time, but there were adoptionists at Rome before Cerinthus, loud in their protests against any other "beginning" than the old-time tradition which made the "beginning of the gospel" coincide with "the baptism of John." Streeter is therefore likely to be correct in postulating the necessity of some kind of official action at Rome early in the second century to enable Mt to circulate there on a parity with Mk.

We may distinguish accordingly *three* stages, not two only, in the history of the origin and dissemination of our first canonical Gospel. Its origin was certainly in (northern?) Syria, probably in some bilingual region northward of Damascus and eastward of Antioch, where Nazarene traditions were current. From thence it spread southward (in Aramaic targum) down the Euphrates toward India and (in the original Greek) westward toward Antioch, where Ignatius accepts it, most likely along with a claim that it was (perhaps in some broad sense) "according to" Matthew. The third stage of the Gospel's advance toward canonization is a consequence of Ignatius' journey, and of the immense effect of his martyrdom at Rome about 115. His epistles, collected by Polycarp not later than 115, and almost canonized from the start, make prominent use of the Matthean Epiphany story of Magi and Star. Rome, not Antioch, nor Ephesus, after due deliberation and consultation, put the final stamp of its unparalleled authority upon the book as authentic and apostolic. Under this aegis its further triumph was assured.

But the beginnings of the process were earlier. In 140 we already find Papias and in 167 his successor Apollinaris in Phrygia using Mt with the same assurance as Ignatius, and even surpassing Ignatius in their strict interpretation of the "according to" of the title. This is unlikely to have been out of mere deference to the verdict of Rome in 120. The visit of Ignatius to Phrygia in 115 had borne fruit here also, and even earlier than in Rome. Lay difficulties were encountered still where Quartodeciman observance entailed the necessity of adjustment to the chronology of Jn. Controversy continued for at least a half-century. But Rome and the bishops together could not but prevail, even in Asia. Shortly after 167 the same objections are echoed by opponents of the fourth Gospel in the famous resistance of Caius at Rome. But here the situation is reversed. It is Mt which now stands secure in every quarter, whereas "Phrygian" supporters of the fourth Gospel must find some harmonistic interpretation or see the writings of their (Johannine) canon rejected. In the *Muratorianum*, and all later canons based upon Roman usage, Mt is the

foundation of everything, a long defense of "John" proves that "although varying ideas may be taught in the several books of the evangelists, there is no difference in that which pertains to the faith of believers," in particular as regards "the nativity" and "the passion" of Jesus. The popular verdict endorses this harmonistic interpretation down to our own day, without understanding why the Nativity and the Passion should be the special points of dispute.

We have now followed up to its remotest possibility of serviceable content the ancient tradition as to Mt. Its "single root" can be traced back of Papias solely in the title "According to Matthew," which Papias takes in the strict sense, but which, as Plummer points out, "need not mean more than 'drawn up according to the teaching of.' " Our study of its spread suggests the following event as the probable source of the remarkable re-enforcement given to its "backing" a score of years before Papias wrote. A Roman provincial council was held under Sixtus I about 120 A.D., whose verdict endorsed the title "According to Matthew": on what grounds, or in what sense, can only be conjectured. It is "conceivable," Zahn to the contrary notwithstanding, that the apostolic name was originally applied at Antioch because of the curious difference in Mt 9:9 from Mk 2:14. More probably the step was first taken in *Ev. Hebr.* In either case, the conjecture has no value whatever. It is certain that the name "Matthew" is wrongly attached to the Gospel. Just when and where the title was first prefixed is uncertain, but at all events this was at some other than its place of origin. The name was prefixed in order to distinguish it from other gospels circulating in the same region concurrently with it.

Nothing whatever can be made of the epithet "the publican." It does not properly apply to Matthew, but to Levi the son of Alphaeus; and Levi and Matthew cannot be the same person. The title was *not* transferred from the Second Source, which is not an apostolic writing and was never treated as such by any writer to whom we can look as having made use of it. It is not likely to have been transferred from those peculiarly "Matthean" traditions of late origin and apocryphal character from which Mt derives his element N. They would contribute little to the apostle's reputation, and can only have "grown up outside the range of the control which apostles or other eye-witnesses would have exercised." Transfer from the *Ev. Hebr.* is easily conceivable, but the claim of *Ev. Hebr.* is itself mere conjecture based on Mt 9:9 which adopts a false reading of Mk 2:14. For real information concerning the background and origin of Mt we are thrown back upon the internal evidence.

B. INTERNAL EVIDENCE

CHAPTER V

(1) INFERENCE FROM SOURCES TO DATE

Historical interpretation of any ancient writing demands as chief prerequisite all available information concerning date and place of origin. Our scrutiny of the tradition regarding Mt has resulted in a fairly definite and almost unanimous verdict as to the general region of its provenance, and an approximate agreement as to the *terminus ad quem* of its date. It is certainly Syrian, probably North Syrian, in origin, and earlier than Ignatius. The *terminus a quo* of its date must be determined as in every other case of disputed antiquity from the internal evidence; that is, the knowledge displayed by the evangelist of writings or events whose date is better known.

Modern criticism with practical unanimity reverses the belief of antiquity concerning the relation of Mt to Mk. The dependence is not on the side of Mk, as imagined by Augustine and probably by Augustine's predecessors so far as they observed the literary connection, but on the side of Mt. As respects the extent and mode of this employment more will appear presently. The fact is indisputable and of course determines the relative date. What, then, is the date of Mk?

The ancients, beginning with Irenaeus (186), place the composition of Mk "after the death of Peter and Paul." This seems to be an inference from the testimony of "the Elder" quoted by Papias to the effect that Mark was unable to supply the order of an eyewitness. The inference is probably correct. Had the apostles, particularly Peter, been accessible to our second evangelist, his failure to secure a better order would be inexplicable. As respects chronological sequence Mk's order is the best that survives and was so treated even in antiquity, but critical enquiry makes clearer and clearer the truth of the ancient judgment, that Mk has not given a biography, but a mere grouping of stories of Jesus' sayings and doings taken down from the preacher's occasional utterance.

How long after the death of Peter and Paul Mark wrote Irenaeus does not attempt to say. Irenaeus makes no reference at all in this connection to the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., though many moderns make this groundless assumption. He probably dates the death of Peter and Paul in the last year of Nero (67–68), after a common practice of the Fathers.[1] In making the composition of Mk later than

[1] The dispersion of the Twelve was dated "twelve years" after the Ascension, *i.e.*, 42 A.D. Peter's stay in Rome was extended over twenty-five years, *i.e.*, 42–67.

this Irenaeus doubtless reflects the real meaning of Papias, though later writers (Clement, Jerome), anxious to avoid a post-apostolic origin for the Gospel, find various expedients to account for Mk's neglect in the matter of "order."

Within the last few decades some eminent modern scholars have based on particular passages in Mk arguments in favor of a much earlier dating. But at most these inferences from internal evidence could establish no more than an earlier date for the individual passages concerned. The ancient dating of the Gospel, placing it after the close of the apostolic age as defined by Clement (the age of apostolic teaching, including specifically that of "Peter" and Paul, "ends with Nero" *Strom.* VII, xvii.), would still stand for the work as a whole. My own enquiry [2] substantiates the ancient view, dating the work in ± 80 A.D. The Gospels of Mt and Lk would then have appeared about a decade later, sufficiently near to one another in date to account for their mutual independence, and long enough after the Roman Gospel to account for its wide dissemination and apparently high valuation. But since the date *c.* 80 for Mk is disputed, corroboration of the provisional date 90–100 for Mt must be sought in the Gospel itself to disprove recent attempts to carry back the entire Synoptic literature to a date before the overthrow of Jerusalem, and even into the midst of the missionary activities of Peter and Paul.

A brief synopsis of the evidence given by McNeile (p. xxvii.) for the date of Mt individually will serve as a starting point for our enquiry. After adopting the quotations of Ignatius as fixing a *terminus ad quem* in 115 as the best the external evidence can afford McNeile turns to the internal evidence for light on the *terminus a quo:*

> Internal evidence is hardly more helpful; 22:7 clearly presupposes the fall of Jerusalem. The expressions ἕως ἄρτι (11:12), ἕως τῆς σήμερον (27:8), μέχρι τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας (28:15) suggest no more than some lapse of time since the days of Jesus. But a few indications point to a comparatively late date. Church government is alluded to (16:19; 18:18), and excommunication (18:17). The apostles, as the foundation of the Church, are so highly reverenced that their faults are often minimized or concealed. . . . False Christian prophets had appeared (7:15, 22); *cf. Did.* xi–xiii. Additions which are certainly apocryphal had begun to be made. And the writer, though he had not abandoned the expectation, still found in the 2d century, that the Parousia of Christ was near, and freely recorded the Lord's predictions to that effect, was yet able to look forward to a period during which the evangelization of "all nations" (*sc.* of the known world) would be carried on (28:19 f.). These facts, which are in keeping with the impression produced by the Gospel as a whole, forbid a date earlier than *c.* A.D. 80, but do not require one later than 100.

[2] *GM*, 1925.

This statement of the case for a date between 80 and 100 could hardly be improved upon for clarity, but its confident tone calls for some justification, if not corroboration also.

Without the Lukan parallel Mt's parable of the Slighted Invitation (Mt. 22:1–14) scarcely reveals why McNeile relies upon it with such confidence. The parable forms part of the Q material.[3] The versions of Mt and Lk placed side by side enable us to restore the original S when due account is taken of the style distinctive of Mt and Lk respectively. The exact nature of the Matthean changes (printed in italic), will then be apparent. Some of these merely exhibit this evangelist's habitual alterations of style and phraseology; others, including his two additions of verses 6 f. and 11–14, affect the substance of the parable. Of these two the latter (verses 11–14) belongs to a type of Matthean supplements discussed elsewhere and may be postponed. The former (verses 6 f.) proves its editorial character in part by incongruous traits of allegory (guests invited to a banquet do not in real life abuse and kill the bearers of the invitation, nor does the "king" who sends the invitation retaliate by sending "armies" to kill the murderers and "burn their city"). It appears mainly in the fact that the Lukan transcript of S shows not a trace of this section, though Lk too has not hesitated to make additions of his own. For Lk also supplements in verses 21b–23a by prefixing to the final sending of the "servant" (singular) a previous sending, carried out after the pattern laid down in the preceding saying (verse 13). The editorial changes in Mt will be best seen if we place the two reports in parallel columns, giving Lk, as the more nearly authentic, the position on the left. Editorial supplements are enclosed between — —.

Lk 14:16–24	Mt 22:1–10
But he said to him A certain man made a great supper and invited many. And he sent his servant at the hour set for the supper to say to the invited guests, Come, for all things are now ready. And they all with one consent began to make excuse. The first said to him, I have bought a field and must needs go forth and view it. I pray thee, hold me excused. And another said, I have bought five yoke of oxen, and I am going out to test them; I pray thee, hold me excused. And another said,	*And Jesus answered and spake to them again in parables,* saying, *The kingdom of heaven is likened unto* a certain *king who* made a *marriage* supper *for his son.* And he sent forth his servants to invite the guests to the *wedding,* and they would not come. *Again he sent other servants, saying, Tell the guests, Lo, I have prepared my banquet, my oxen and my fatlings are slaughtered and all things are ready; come to the wedding.* But they paid no heed and went away, one to his field, another

[3] Harnack, *Beitr.* II throws some doubt on this classification, but see below, p. 94.

I have married a wife, and on this account I cannot come. And the servant came and reported these things to his master. Then the householder was angry and said to his servant, Go forth quickly—into the streets and lanes of the city, and bring in hither the poor and maimed and blind and lame. And the servant said, Master, what thou badest is done, and there is still room. And the master said to his servant, Go forth—into the highways and hedges and constrain them to come in, that my house may be filled. For I say unto you that not one of those men that were invited shall taste of my supper.

to his merchandize.—***And the rest laid hold on his servants and maltreated and killed them. But the king was angry and sent his armies and destroyed those murderers and burned their city.***—Then he saith to his servants, ***The wedding is ready, but the invited guests were not worthy.*** Go forth, then, to the partings of the roads and invite all that ye find to the ***wedding.*** So those servants went forth into the highways and gathered all that they found, ***both bad and good,*** and the ***wedding*** was supplied with guests.

Mt has obviously quite rewritten the parable, giving it the form of allegory and using as model that of Mk 12:1–9. We are not here concerned with details of style, such as the change from "householder" to "king," "banquet" to "marriage supper for his son," or the curious insertion of the clause "both bad and good" after the model of 13:24–30, 36–43, 47–50, in preparation for the supplement in verses 11–14. We note only as part of this process of allegorization the insertion of verses 6 f., depicting the fate of Jerusalem as the city which had rejected the messengers of God. Even so close a parallel as this to the actual fate of the guilty city might not be wholly unexampled in the warnings of prophets concerning the doom of the disobedient. But we are not now concerned with Jesus' original warning. It is the *re-writing* of a parable of Jesus *to adapt it to the event* which makes the interpolated verses seem, in the judgment of critics as conservative as McNeile, to "clearly presuppose the fall of Jerusalem." Face to face with the supplements we cannot but concur with this judgment of the relation of Mt to S.

A date later than 70 A.D. being thus established for Mt, all arguments based on archaic forms or interests in particular passages fall to the ground. For the date of a book is not that of its embodied material, much of which may be derived from earlier writings, with more or less editorial revision according as the special proclivities of the excerptor are, or are not, involved. *The date of a book is the date of the latest thing inserted in it by the author.* And no textual or higher critic will venture to assert that the supplementary verses inserted in the Matthean form of the parable of the Slighted Invitation are not the work of the evangelist himself. The question of date, therefore,

ceases to be "Before or after the fall of Jerusalem?", and takes now the form "How much later" than 70 A.D.?

The considerations above cited, which induce McNeile in common with the majority of critics to place the composition at "a comparatively late date" are all germane and cogent; particularly so if on independent grounds one have reached the conclusion that Mk, Mt's principal source, cannot be earlier than *c.* 80. Nevertheless the extreme brevity of mention in McNeile's discussion makes it advisable to offer some further comment, particularly with reference to the Matthean eschatology, principally set forth in the Doom of Jerusalem (24:1–51) and admittedly based for the most part on Mk. The so-called Little Apocalypse of Mk is still our best reliance for the dating of that Gospel, because from the very method adopted by the apocalyptic writers the transition from *vaticinia ex eventu*, with which they commonly begin, to real prediction, with which they close, is relatively easy to trace.

In the case of Mk we had occasion to observe [4] that the incorporation (for substance) of an apocalypse of 40 A.D., independently attested by Paul in I Thess. 4:15 and elsewhere, has no bearing on the date of Mk apart from such modifications as the evangelist himself can be shown to have introduced to adapt it to his own times. In Chapter IX of the volume cited, entitled "The Markan Doom-chapter in Matthean Adaptation" it was shown that the apocalypse of the year 40 employed (with modifications) by Paul in 50 had undergone further modification in Mk 13 to adapt it to conditions after the fall of Jerusalem. It was also shown that in Mt 24 the same Doom-chapter had been still further modified and supplemented from SQ partly to bring it into more exact agreement with "Daniel the prophet," but also to enhance its predictions of a second Coming but shortly delayed; for such is the constant tendency of all the Matthean transcriptions of Markan eschatology. As this tendency is imperfectly understood, so that critics still occasionally argue for the priority of Mt's material over Mk's in such passages as Mt. 24:29=Mk. 13:24, where Mt predicts the Parousia "immediately" after the Great Tribulation, while Mk only predicts it as "thereafter," it will be well briefly to restate the conclusions of my former argument.

All characterizations of Mt by recent critics point to his tendency to enhance passages of Mk predicting the Second Coming of the Christ to judgment. Mk reflects on the contrary the Pauline teaching of the Thessalonian Epistles directed to the *holding in check* of an excessive and perhaps fanatical millenarianism. Mt aims to *rekindle* the hope of the Parousia, and makes his constantly repeated warnings of coming judgment one of the main incentives of his Gospel

[4] *GM*, pp. 53–120.

to the "good works" which in it are to be the ground of justification. The passage of the Doom-chapter to which we have just referred is one of the conspicuous instances of this enhancement, and (as above noted) because of failure to understand the evangelist's point of view is still sometimes quoted as proof that in this instance at least Mt must be reproducing the source in earlier and more authentic form. Indeed there are not a few who discover in the word "immediately" a proof that the evangelist was writing very soon after, or even before, the fall of Jerusalem. Apart, then, from the general tendency let us consider the specific instance.

If the Great Tribulation, "immediately" after which the second Coming should occur, still meant primarily to Mt, as *perhaps* it did to Mk, the Jewish war, which culminated in that catastrophe, the argument from it for an early dating of Mt might have cogency. But to take this view of the context, especially of the immediately preceding paragraph, one must wear the spectacles of Josephus, or those of some modern historian to whom this particular event in a long series of Jewish catastrophes stands out with much greater prominence than to contemporaries. It is better to see with the eyes of the evangelist himself.

As will be shown presently in greater detail the paragraph which precedes the prediction of the End in Mt 24:29–31 is *epexegetical.* The οὖν resumptive which Mt interjects at its beginning is intended to indicate this relation to the preceding paragraph ending "And then shall the End come" (24:9–14). Consequently we are not intended by Mt to understand that there will be *two* periods of exposure of the Church to the sufferings and temptations described in verses 9–14 (a substitute, largely of the evangelist's own composition, for the Markan equivalent which he had previously utilized in 10:17–21), but the "tribulation" here described is *the same* set forth in greater detail in 15–28, even the particular word "tribulation" (θλῖψις) being borrowed from the Markan context in the latter passage (24:21 = Mk 13:19) as if to mark the identity. This "Great Tribulation," accordingly, which in Mk begins with the Profanation and Jewish war (Mt 24:15–22 = Mk 13:14–20), and ends with the Great Apostasy (Mt 24:23–25 = Mk 13:21–23), a tribulation which Mt further enlarges upon by adding from S^q verses 26–28 (= Lk 17:23 f., 37), is understood by Mt to include both the persecution of the Church *and the apostasy caused by the "teachers of lawlessness" described in verses 9 and 10–14.* When, therefore, we read his encouraging assurance in verse 29 of a Redemption to come "*immediately* after the tribulation of those days" we should realize that Mt is not speaking primarily, as Mk perhaps does, of the "tribulation" of "those in Judea." He is speaking inclusively. He refers to the "tribulation" of *the Church,*

a tribulation in which the sufferings endured during the Jewish war are only a part, perhaps not the greatest. Moreover of this broader period of "tribulation" the πλανή, or great Apostasy, is the culminating phase. In other words Mt makes no prediction that the Second Coming will follow "immediately" after the *fall of Jerusalem.* He predicts (what is much more to the purpose for his readers) that it will come immediately after the worst sufferings of *the Church.* Indeed, he shows by his additions (verses 10 f., 14, and 26–28) before and after Mk 13:14–23, that to his mind these sufferings do *not* culminate in the period of the Jewish war, but at an indefinite time after it, during which time all the experiences take place which are described in verses 9–14, some of them again in greater detail in 15–28. These experiences include not only the persecution and hatred of the Christians by "all the Gentiles" (verse 9) but extend to a wider horizon than Mk's and a considerably later date. There must be, says Mt, the Falling away of Many, because of the coming of False Prophets and the Error of Lawlessness (11–13). There must also be the Preaching of "this gospel of the kingdom in the entire inhabited world for a testimony to the Gentiles" (verse 14).

Read thus, with some attention to the context, this altered Matthean form of the Markan Doom-chapter can hardly be said to *advance the time* of the Parousia, though it unquestionably does *change the emphasis.* In Mk we have repression of apocalyptic hopes, in Mt encouragement and reassurance. In reality the shifting of sympathy from "those in Judea," as victims of the Great Tribulation, to the world-wide Church as the real victim, carries us forward in time, not backward. Thus Mt's *modification* of the Markan Doom-chapter, rightly interpreted, only corroborates the long list of other indications of a "comparatively late date." [5]

The relation of Mt to Lk also has a bearing on the question of date, though the relation is much more difficult to appraise. Here too the drag of fifteen centuries of wrong judgment has had its effect, though less harmfully than in delaying our apprehension of the true relation to Mk. The burden of proof has been thrown upon those who denied the tradition of Lk's dependence on Mt, with the result of making a genuinely critical judgment a much slower acquisition, though in the end more sure.

The first step, whose grounds we need not restate from the careful studies already cited,[6] was the demonstration, now generally admitted, that there is no *direct* literary relation between Mt and Lk. Such minor resemblances as appear, apart from the common use of the two principal sources S and Mk, are *indirect;* that is, they also

[5] See Appended Note IV. The Little Apocalypse of Mk and Mt.

[6] Above, p. 33.

are due either to (1) textual assimilations by transcribers who tend normally to make Lk agree with Mt, or (2) accidental coincidence between Mt and Lk in improving the style of their sources, or (3) remote effects of parallel traditions, in most cases merely oral, circulating in the vicinity at the date of composition. The influences last-named of course affect substance rather than the minutiae of form.

The second step of emancipation from the drag of erroneous tradition followed naturally upon the recognition of this mutual independence of Mt and Lk. As already noted, Stanton, Streeter, and others make the reasonable inference that the date of the two Gospels cannot be far apart. Had either evangelist known of the other's work it is improbable that he would not have availed himself of it. This argument is especially applicable to Lk, whose preface (Lk 1:1–4) shows that he did not write without careful enquiry into the work of predecessors; but it is measurably applicable to Mt also. Of course this inference from the mutual independence of Mt and Lk becomes more cogent in proportion as we trace the origin of the two to regions geographically in closer proximity. As we have seen, tradition, dissemination, and internal evidence favor the origin of both Gospels in northern Syria, Lk embodying the traditions of Antioch, Caesarea, and Jerusalem, Mt those of Antioch (including Mk and S) but in a form, and with additions, indicative of a more easterly environment than that from which we derive our fragments of *Ev. Naz.* We may be fairly certain that Lk did not know of the existence of Mt when he wrote, and almost as certain that Mt had no *direct* knowledge of the existence of Lk.

Another step away from the ancient tradition is taken by a small, but increasingly important group of scholars who argue from even the *indirect* relation of Mt and Lk, and on other grounds, that Mt is the later of the two. Of these scholars one of the earliest was Pfleiderer, who in the second edition of his *Urchristenthum* (Vol. I, pp. 601–614) pointed to the often noted "contradictory" character of the elements of Mt as significant of its late nature as a sort of primitive "gospel harmony," the relatively late character of its "ecclesiastical" rules, such as the "Trinitarian" baptismal formula (Mt 28:19) as compared with the Lukan (Acts 2:38 and *passim*), and the apocryphal character of its N element. These proved, in Pfleiderer's judgment, a later origin for Mt than Lk. He dated Mt "within the first half of the second century."

For von Soden also (*History of Early Christian Literature*, Engl. 1906, pp. 181–200) Mt "marks the close of the primitive Christian development of gospel literature." Von Soden renews the argument of Pfleiderer for Mt's relatively later date from the diverse character

of the ingredients of Mt, and from its ecclesiastical, "catechetic" nature:

> Paul's spirit is alien to it, though his language may be employed here and there. It points onward to the development towards Catholicism; hence it became the chief gospel, the work which took the lead in guiding this development, and in so far no book ever written is of greater historical importance. We Protestant Christians of today ought however to recognize that we can gain from St. Mk and St. Lk a surer knowledge of the essential nature of the gospel message than from this Roman (*sic*) gospel of the third generation.

The most recent addition to the group of scholars who argue from the indirect relation of Mt to Lk a date sufficiently later to allow of some tincture of oral influence is von Dobschütz, whose article "Matthäus als Rabbiner und Katechet" in the *ZNW* for 1928 has already been referred to.[7]

Von Dobschütz is no less convinced than Pfleiderer that the preface of Lk "completely excludes" the possibility of acquaintance with Mt. He also agrees that *direct* acquaintance of Mt with Lk is improbable, but finds it difficult to account for the prefixing to Mk's narrative of a genealogy (however inconsistent with Lk's) and a story of miraculous birth apart from indirect suggestion from Lk. That is, he holds that the new doctrinal features affecting the Markan outline would not have found acceptance in the circles whence Mt comes had not Lk paved the way. In addition von Dobschütz considers that we have the possibility of direct dependence by Mt on one of the earliest and greatest leaders in the reorganization of Judaism after the catastrophe of 70 A.D. Mt, the "converted rabbi," might well (thinks von Dobschütz) have been a "disciple" of the famous Johanan ben Zacchai (10–80 A.D.), one of the original founders of the rabbinic school of "teachers" (*Tannaim*) at Jamnia.

Johanan, a reputed disciple of Hillel, took refuge along with his disciples in the camp of Vespasian at the siege of Jerusalem, and was distinguished not merely for his part in refounding the legalistic Judaism of the Synagogue but for his leaning toward eschatology of the apocalyptic type. A scripture passage twice introduced by Mt in support of the action of Jesus (Mt 9:13 and 12:7) was a favorite with Johanan ben Zacchai to comfort his fellow-Jews for the cessation of the temple services. Cited according to the typical rabbinic formula from Hos. 6:6 the word would be "Go learn what that meaneth: I will have mercy and not sacrifice" (*cf.* Mt 9:13 and 12:7).

A single coincidence of this kind would not go far to support the

[7] Above, p. 47.

theory of dependence, however just the characterization of Mt as a "converted rabbi," and however congenial the special tendencies of Synagogue leader and Church catechist. But it may be possible to add a further parallel of greater weight.

We have seen above that Mt rewrites the SQ parable of the Slighted Invitation, introducing in verses 6 f. an allegorizing reference to the fate of Jerusalem. He also appends in verses 11–14 a supplement in the interest of his favorite moral of good works (for the "garment of good works" *cf.* Rev. 19:8), our indispensable safeguard against judgment to come. Our transcription italicizes the Matthean phrases.

> But when *the King* came in to behold the guests, he saw there a man which had not on a wedding garment: and he saith unto him, Friend, how camest thou in hither not having a wedding garment? And he was speechless. Then *the King* said to the servants, Bind him hand and foot, and *cast him out into the outer darkness; there shall be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth.* For many are called, but few chosen.

Some critics are disposed to regard this supplement as a second parable drawn from oral tradition (in spite of its unmistakable Matthaisms of language) on account of its maladjustment to the context (for how are the wedding garments to be obtained?). Oral tradition has probably played its part, because Mt has a minimum of real originality. But Mt 22:11–14 is not drawn from any known Christian source whether oral or written. Its affiliations are purely Jewish. For in all the parallels from rabbinic tradition adduced by Fiebig as examples of Jewish parabolic teaching there is none which can compare in closeness with the parable of Johanan ben Zacchai commenting on the passage in Eccl. 9:8 "Let thy garments be always white." Johanan made this text a command to fulfil "the commandments and good works of the Torah" "*always*"; that is, in constant expectation of the Judgment. Judah the Prince (*c.* 200) tells the parable in Johanan's name in support of this interpretation:

> To whom shall we liken the matter?
>
> To a certain King who made a banquet and invited guests. He said to them, "Go, wash, cleanse, and anoint yourselves; put on clean garments and prepare for the banquet"; but he set no time for their coming. Now the prudent lingered at the door of the King's palace, saying, "Will anything be wanting (for a banquet) in a king's palace?" But the foolish took no heed and were not observant of the King's word. They said, "We shall notice in time the hour for the King's banquet. Is there ever a banquet without preparations?" Thus they talked with one another. And the whitewasher betook himself to his lime, the potter to his clay, the smith to his charcoal, the fuller to his laundry. Suddenly the King sent word: "Let all go in to the banquet." So they made haste; the one group entered in their festal garments, the other in their disarray. But the King

took pleasure in the prudent because they had honored the word of the King; yea, because they had even had regard for his palace.[8] And he was angry with the foolish because they had paid no heed to the King's word and had dishonored his palace. Then said the King: These who prepared themselves for the banquet may go in and eat at the King's table, but those who did not prepare may not eat at the King's table; at the most they may take their leave and withdraw. Nay; rather, let these sit at my table and eat and drink, while the others stand up and take their punishment; they shall look on and be envious.

So shall it be in the future; this is that which was spoken by Isaiah (Is. 65:13) "Behold, my servants shall eat, but ye shall be hungry."

Motive and standpoint of this parable of *c.* 70 A.D. are not wholly alien from the authentic teaching of Jesus (*cf.* Mk 13:33:37 and parallels). But they are distinctive of Mt's; even the form and style agreeing. Emphasis on inward vs. outward is distinctive in Jesus' teaching. Emphasis on "now" vs. "hereafter" is more characteristic of "the most apocalyptic of our evangelists." On all grounds, non-appearance in Lk, style, location, and motive, the supplement is Matthean; though not, of course, without oral precedent. Shall we assume without evidence that this was Christian tradition, handing down a saying of Jesus elsewhere unrecorded? Or shall we hold that Mt is here dependent on the tradition of the Synagogue transmitted in the Jewish line from Johanan ben Zacchai (*c.* 70) to Judah the Prince (*c.* 200), through the medium of R. Me'ir (130–160) and R. Eliezer (90–130)?

A closer approximation than 80–100, or more exactly 90–95, for this Gospel is hardly required; because the purpose for which the date is sought is to bring the writing into true relation with its environment, particularly the mental environment of contemporary Christian literature. Now the history of the period is extremely obscure, and few Christian writings survive from it, these few being themselves in most cases difficult to date with precision. Enough, however, are available to determine the atmosphere of the time.

The best assured as respects date is the Revelation of John, a composite apocalypse which in its latest, or Ephesian form, prefixes seven letters of the Spirit to the churches of Asia, and can be dated "in the end of the reign of Domitian (*c.* 93)." First Clement is probably not more than a year or two later. To this period belong also the great "false prophets and false Christs," who come forward with the self-deifying utterances which Celsus observed as characteristic of the religious enthusiasts of "Phoenicia and Palestine," "false prophets" who said "I am God; I am the Son (παῖς) of God"; or

[8] That is, by assuming that there would be no lack of supplies, and hence no opportunity to take note of special preparations.

"I am the Spirit of God," etc. (Origen, *Ctr. Celsus*, VI, xi. and VII, ix.; *cf.* Eusebius, *HE*, III, xxvi.). Dositheus and Simon Magus (more especially the latter) may well be referred to in Mk 13:22 f. Mt's parallel (24:24 f.) might even tactily include in the Samaritan group Menander of Capparatea, and in Transjordan El-kesi (the Hidden One) whose apocalyptic prophecies were recorded in the early years of Trajan (98–101).

Unfortunately it is not possible to date with precision the Pastoral Epistles (90–95?), which are loud in their complaint against a growing heresy of "vain talkers and deceivers, specially those of the circumcision," expressly foretold by the prophetic Spirit as typical of "the last times" (Ti. 1:10 ff., II Tim. 3:1 ff., 4:3 f.; I Tim. 1:3 ff., 4:1–5). The remedies recommended are the same as Mt's, the "health-giving words" of Jesus to counteract the "sickly" questionings of the false teachers (I Tim. 6:3 ff.), practice of his "commandment" (6:14), "good works" (Ti. 3:8–11), and above all church discipline (I Tim. *passim*, II Tim. 2:14–17, 3:13 ff.; Ti. 1:5–3:11): P. N. Harrison in his volume *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles* (1921) has given a convincing philological demonstration that the particular elements of the Pastoral Epistles with which we are concerned date from *c.* 90–95. There can be little doubt that the allusion to a prediction by the Spirit of an apostasy in the last times refers to the Little Apocalypse (Mk 13:5, 21–23 = Mt 24:4 f., 23–25 and 24:11 f.). Unfortunately the reference is too general to make practicable identification of either its Matthean or its Markan form. Quite probably it reflects a form earlier than either. We can only say that Mt, Revelation, and the Pastorals confront the same perils of church demoralization, but that the coincidence of remedies to be applied is not a matter of literary dependence. Evil and remedy alike belong to the spirit of the age.

Still more difficult to date exactly are the "general" Epistles of Jas. and Jude, both of which, but especially Jude, show close affinity with Mt. Jas. is principally concerned with the growing worldliness of the Church catholic, and the tendency to "vain talk" (*ματαιολογία*) as a substitute for good works. Jude dwells more on the doctrinal side of the heresy, which rebels against church discipline and mocks at the threat of impending judgment at the Lord's Coming. Both church writers are emphatic on the rewards and penalties of "the last days" and "the Coming of the Lord" (Jas. 3:1; 4:11 ff.; 5:1–9; Jude *passim*). Jas. can only be dated with certainty between 75 and 125 (Ropes in *ICC*). It has been placed by the present writer less certainly *c.* 90 (*Introd.*, p. 165). Jude, which again makes specific reference to the apostolic prediction of the *πλανή* (verses 17–19), was placed "not far from" the same date (*ibid.*, p. 170). Slightly later

are the Epistles and Gospel of Jn, which deal with the heresy more on the doctrinal side, while Ps-Barnabas (132?) with its pronounced neo-legalism is later still. Ignatius and Polycarp (115) reveal the same conditions and apply the same remedies. Second Pt (130–140?) goes beyond Jude to plunge us into the midst of the Chiliastic controversy, concerned with denials of "the resurrection and judgment" (Polycarp vii.).

What, then, are the salient characteristics and perils of the Church in Mt's age? For, as we have noticed, his horizon, like that of the "general" Epistles, is wide. He contemplates the spread of Christianity "among all the nations," and has in view the problems and perils of a world-wide "Church" of Christ (16:19; 24:14; 28:19 f.). He envisages a new Israel, a "nation" which brings forth the fruits God expects from his "vineyard" (21:44), and encourages the apocalyptic hope for an impending "consummation."

The following features stand out strikingly as soon as we raise the question of Mt's implied environment:

(1) As respects conditions within the Church. It appears to be a time of lassitude and moral relaxation. The love of many has "grown cold." Mt feels keenly the lack of "good works," and spurs disciples on to set an example to the world in this particular (24:12; 5:13–16). He appeals especially to expectation of the coming Day of the Son of Man, when "all nations" will be gathered before "the throne of his glory" to receive "every man according to his deeds" (7:22 f.; 16:27; 25:31 ff.). The doers of good works will receive bliss in "the kingdom prepared from the foundation of the world," the empty-handed "everlasting torment prepared for the devil and his angels."

A further contemporary remedy for this demoralization in the Church is stricter discipline. Mt approves this method. For while the Church is forbidden to attempt a premature separation of the good from the bad (13:36–43, 47–50) it must submit on most points of conduct to authoritative rulings by its governors. "Peter" in 16:18 f., the body of disciples in 18:18, are given authority to "bind and loose." Excommunication, when unavoidable, must be carried out according to fixed rules (18:17).

The conditions of the time as we have seen, are not reflected in Mt only. The rebuke of the Spirit sent through Jn to the Church in Laodicea in 93 A.D. reveals similar lassitude and lukewarmness (Rev. 3:15–22). This church, like that in Ephesus (Rev. 2:4 f.), had "left its first love" and ceased to do "the former works." The Epistle of Jas. deplores the prevailing lack of "good works," the outcome of a heresy of justification "by faith only, apart from works" (1:12–2:26). Jas. sees a religion of talk in place of deeds, and utters warnings of the coming Day of the Lord, a judgment day which will bring reward

to those who have patiently endured to the end (5:7–11), but condemnation to the worldly-minded (2:1–13; 4:1–17) and to the heartless rich (5:1–6). Jude and I Jn are no less concerned than Jas. about this moral relaxation, I Jn 3:17 f. repeating almost the language of Jas. 2:14 ff. against the kind of "faith" which makes words a substitute for deeds. Jude makes the same appeal as Mt to fear of judgment to come, indulging in similar denunciation of the teachers of "lawlessness" and consignment of them to the "outer darkness" and everlasting torments of Hell. Only, in Jude, and still more in First Jn, the moral laxity and "lawlessness" denounced by all three is laid much more distinctly than in Mt to the charge of a definite system of false teaching.[9] Ps-Barnabas and I Clement belong to regions relatively remote, but the neo-legalism of Barnabas and the emphasis on church discipline of Clement are worthy of note as everywhere characteristic of the time.

On Ignatius' insistence on obedience to the bishop, and tightening of church discipline, as chief remedy for the inroads of heresy, we need not dwell. Polycarp (115) and Papias (140) echo the complaint of the Pastoral Epistles against the "vain talk of the many" and the false teachers, who bring in "alien commandments" and neglect the "commandments given by the Lord to the faith." Polycarp, particularly, specifies "perverting the oracles of the Lord to their own lusts, and denying the resurrection and judgment" as the distinctive marks of the false teachers. He is followed, as respects the latter characteristic, by the supplements Second Pt thinks it desirable to attach to the denunciation of Jude. With the partial exception of the author of the Gospel and Epistles of Jn the writers even of the Pauline churches seem in this period to have gone over to neo-legalism and church discipline as their best weapons against "acute Hellenization." Especially in Syria have those who were "of Cephas" by this time well-nigh eclipsed in influence the followers of Paul. Lk-Acts forms no exception, revolt came only with Marcion in 140.

How far the Gospel of Mt contributed to, and how far it was itself impelled and directed by this reactionary tide, it would be difficult to say. In any event its dominant motives coincide with those of the consolidating Church catholic of the post-Pauline age, and must be understood and valued accordingly. The literature and conditions of 90–100 A.D. give us no hold sufficiently definite for accurate dating, but once this general date is determined the Gospel as a whole shows itself the true product of its age, the age of Revelation, the Pastoral Epistles, Jas. and Jude.

(2) External conditions as reflected in Mt are again such as char-

[9] See, however, Mt 7:15 ff. and 24:11 f.

acterize this same period. Nero's onslaught on the Christians at Rome no doubt produced local attacks elsewhere, though these were held in check during the reigns of Vespasian and Titus. Systematic persecution as an Imperial policy applied throughout the Empire is first heard of under Domitian (81–96). Mt in his first employment of Mk 13:9 in the Mission of the Twelve leaves unchanged Mk's generalizing prediction of hatred by "all men" (10:22). In 24:9 ff. he rewrites the prediction, taking pains now to specify that this hatred will be shown by "all the Gentiles." In borrowing Mk's description of demoralized conditions inside the Church (Mt. 24:10 =Mk 13:12) he attaches still another warning against the "false prophets" (verse 11), in addition to those of verse 5 (=Mk 13:6) and verse 24 (=Mk 13:22), holding their teaching of "lawlessness" responsible for the "cooling of love" in the Church (verse 12). The recasting of the paragraph, changing the order of its elements and adding to them, can only have taken place in an endeavor to define more exactly the course of coming events. Its closing words "and then shall the End come" define the evangelist's horizon.

We have seen that the οὖν resumptive with which Mt takes up Mk's section describing the Profanation, the Judean War and accompanying Tribulation (Mt 24:15–22=Mk 13:14–20) should suffice, apart from the "horizon" just indicated, to show that this section is epexegetic. Mk, after his well-known manner, digresses in order to particularize certain salient and unusual features of the "tribulation" to be endured, resuming his warning against the "false prophets" in 13:23–25. Mt follows suit. Hence when he in turn resumes after his supplement from Q (26–28=Lk 17:23 f., 37) the point of attachment is not to be sought in the digression, but just before it, at the words "and then shall the End come." The description of "the End" in 29–31 is prepared for by the carefully rewritten paragraph 9–14. This puts the order of events as follows:

Tribulation and world-wide persecution (verse 9)
Demoralization in the Church (verse 10).
The False Prophets and πλανή (verses 11–13).
World-wide Proclamation of the Gospel and End (verse 14).

There is a certain change of emphasis in this rearrangement of Mk's perspective, as we should expect from Mt's repeated insertion of warnings against the teachers of "lawlessness" (7:15–23; 13:38–42), of which verses 11 f. constitute the third and last. The subject of persecution has fallen somewhat into the background. The Profanation and War section of Mk (Mk 13:14–20) is still retained, but greater interest is displayed in the πλανή. Mt betrays thus an affinity with the author of the prefatory Epistles of the Spirit in the

Johannine Apocalypse. These later additions contrast with the main body of the book. They look back upon a period of martyrdom which in chh. 4–20 is brought vividly into the foreground. The Asian introduction recalls the heroism of "faithful martyrs" (2:13) and occasionally predicts further persecution; but it is far more deeply concerned about the "false prophets" and prophetesses who "teach my servants to commit fornication and to eat *idolothuta*," a subject totally foreign to the main body of the book.

Clement of Rome at the same date (95) likewise looks back upon the sufferings of the martyrs (v. 1–vi. 4); but his present concern is with insubordination in the Church. He seems to be writing from a period of Imperial toleration, after the great tribulation of Domitian's time has passed (i. 1). On the contrary First Pt. is solely concerned with the "fiery trial" to which not only the churches of Asia are subjected, but also their "brethren throughout the world." Even Hb., whose main purpose is to breathe courage into a church formerly victorious in a "great fight of afflictions" to meet an impending new onslaught, has but a single trace of apprehension for the teachers of lawlessness, who like Esau would sell their birthright of citizenship in Heaven to gratify a transient appetite (Hb. 12:15 f.). There seems thus to be a decided change of emphasis between the earlier writings of this period of the reign of Domitian, and the later. The earlier are so preoccupied with the assaults of the devil going about as a roaring lion that they ignore his subtler attacks as a beguiling serpent.[10]

As between the conditions of the earlier time and the later Mt unquestionably belongs with the later and Mk with the earlier. The beginnings of heresy are not forgotten in Mk nor the persecutions in Mt, but it would be difficult to deny that the reconstruction to which Mt has subjected Mk's Doom-chapter has brought the perils of heresy into the foreground, while persecution, though still vividly remembered, has retired to a less conspicuous place. The difference is too slight to be relied upon as a means of dating, but once an approximate date is found in a "comparatively late" stage of church development "after the death of Peter and Paul," the environment proves to be what the literature of the period would lead us to expect. Mk might have been written from the midst of the period of storm and stress when Domitian was still demanding submission to the tyrant's formula *dominus et deus noster*, when Christians in Asia Minor were girding up the loins of their mind to "sanctify in their hearts Christ as Lord" neither fearing nor being troubled (I Pt. 3:14 f.).

[10] On this change of front from resistance against persecution to resistance against "lawlessness," its personages, date, and the practices involved, see especially Eusebius, *HE*, IV, vii.

Mt could more easily come from that period of relief of which Hegesippus tells, after the cruel Emperor had dismissed in contempt James and Zoker (Zacharias), the grandsons of Jude, as harmless peasants; the period when these "martyrs," returning to Palestine, became leaders of the churches against the new peril of heresy which now began its assault from within (Euseb. *HE*, III, xx. 1–8, and xxxii. 6–8).

CHAPTER VI

MT'S USE OF MK

(2) STRUCTURE

It is fortunately no longer necessary to demonstrate the dependence of Mt on Mk, but merely to observe its proportion, nature, and method. We have observed how unanimous is the agreement among scholars that our first Gospel is in substance an amplified edition of Mk prefaced by a new Introduction and expanded by the addition of large amounts of teaching material, most of which is commonly designated Q because drawn from a source (or sources) largely shared by Lk. The order of Mk is sacrificed in two of Mt's subdivisions (Books II and III), and everywhere narrative is abridged in favor of discourse. In this one may recognize an attempt to correct the two defects of the older Gospel which are pointed out by "the Elder" in Papias' report of tradition current not much later than Mt's own date. Mk only related "some" (ἕνια) of the sayings of Jesus, which had now become the standard of orthodoxy (I Tim. 6:3) and already in Papias' time raised to the level of divine "oracles" (λόγια). Again Mk had been unable to give even these in their true order, because not himself an eyewitness but only an attendant on the discourses of Peter; and Peter's discourses had not been given with the object of constructing an orderly compend of the Lord's oracles but each "as the occasion required."

Mt frames his Gospel as though expressly to meet this criticism. It is an attempt so to supplement Mk as to make of it an "orderly" syntax of the Lord's logia; but "order" for Mt has reference to proper arrangement of the commandments.

Lk shows a consciousness of the same defects in Mk, and uses almost identical remedies. He also writes a new Introduction (1:4–2:52) and inserts masses of discourse material largely drawn from the same source as Mt's. Lk's rearrangement of the order, however, is not aimed at a *σύνταξις τῶν λογίων*, but at a *διήγησις λεχθέντων ἢ πραχθέντων* such as the Roman evangelist had previously composed. Consequently, while Lk makes an occasional self-evident change in Mk's order (*e.g.*, Lk 3:19 f.) this is purely in the interest of better chronological sequence. He limits himself otherwise on this score to interjecting two large sections of non-Markan material in 6:20–8:3

and 9:51–18:14, and superseding the greater part of Mk's Passion narrative by another of unknown derivation. The striking resemblances of general structure and sources between Mt and Lk lend much cogency to the argument of Stanton and Streeter for a date so nearly approximating these two revisers of Mk that neither can have been aware of the undertaking of the other. At the same time we should not forget the important differences involved in Mt's undertaking to make a systematic compend of the logia, and Lk's to compose a more readable "narrative" (*διήγησις*) than his predecessors of events "in their order."

The governing principle of Mt's revised version of the Reminiscences of Peter (*ἀπομνημονεύματα Πέτρου*)—for so we may infer from Papias and Justin the Roman Gospel was called—was to furnish a full and "orderly" compend of the Lord's commandments. This seems to be the judgment of Papias on the work, and if so the ancient writer has correctly divined the evangelist's intention. For, as we have already seen, [1] the Gospel of Mt, when compared with Mk, displays exactly this difference. Its compiler conceives it as the chief duty of the twelve to be "scribes made disciples to the kingdom of heaven" (11:52). It is their function, in the words of Jesus, to evangelize the world by "teaching all men everywhere to obey all things whatsoever I have commanded you" (28:19 f.). Mt's own task could only differ from the disciples' as respects method, his being indirect and literary instead of direct and oral. He would be systematic. But as respects system Mt's idea is typically Hebraic. Unmistakably he is of Jewish origin and training, with unbounded reverence for the Law; consequently he cannot conceive of any arrangement of "commandments to be observed" better than the Mosaic. The Torah consists of five books of the commandments of Moses, each body of law introduced by a narrative of considerable length, largely concerned with the "signs and wonders" by which Jehovah "with an outstretched hand and a mighty arm" redeemed his people from Egyptian bondage. Mt is a "converted rabbi," a Christian legalist. Each of the "five books" of his "syntaxis of the logia" of Jesus begins with an introductory narrative and closes with a stereotyped formula linking its discourse to the next succeeding narrative section. The formula "and it came to pass when Jesus had finished these," etc., seems to be derived, like many other formulae of Mt, from S; for it occurs once in Lk also (Mt 7:28=Lk 7:1, *β* text), and this at the same point where Mt first uses it, the close of the great discourse on Filial Righteousness. So clearly marked is this division that it has not only attracted the attention of modern critics since critical study of the Gospel began, but had been

[1] Above, pp. 47 ff.

observed as early as the second century if we may thus date the iambic verses above referred to, which speak of "Matthew" as writing "five books" against the "God-slaying" people of the Jews.[2]

No attempt to define the nature and purpose of Mt's revision of Mk is adequate which does not bring into true perspective this constructive feature of the work. It is not enough to take up *seriatim* the particular changes effected by the evangelist in the order and language of his model, though this has been done many times, notably by Allen in his volume of the *ICC*. To understand *why* these changes are made, more especially the changes of order in Books II and III, one must gain some insight into the evangelist's design as revealed in the outline and structure of his compilation. For these five Books are certainly not, as imagined by Godet and some of the older critics, derived from an earlier composition such as the imaginary "Logia spoken of by Papias," but with the single exception of the first (wholly composed of S material) are uniformly *built up on the basis of Mk.* They therefore belong strictly to Mt himself so far as structural arrangement is concerned, and indeed can be proved by evidence of phraseology and purpose to be, even as respects material, the work of his own pen to a much larger extent than is commonly realized. This demonstration will naturally be reserved for our special chapters introductory to each of the five Books. For the present we limit ourselves to notice of the fact and its significance. The purpose of our evangelist in revising and expanding the Gospel of Mk is to furnish an ordered Compend of the Commandments of Jesus. His method is to introduce large extracts of S material, also revised and expanded, in the form of five discourses of Jesus, the first on Filial Righteousness (chh. 5–7), the second on The Duty of Evangelists (ch. 10), the third on The Mystery of the Kingdom (ch. 13), the fourth on The Duty of Church Administrators (ch. 18), the fifth on Preparedness for the Coming (chh. 23–25). Naturally the narrative introductions are in most cases principally based on Mk, though in III, A most of the material is from the Second Source, and in I, A and V, A, Q furnishes considerable sections of the introductory narrative. In chh. 1 f. a general Introduction or Preamble, derived neither from S nor Mk, is prefixed to the whole composition. Its material naturally calls for special study as throwing most light on the particular standpoint and environment of the evangelist.[3]

Deferring to the chapters of special introduction to Books II and

[2] See my article "The Five Books of Matthew against the Jews" in *Expositor*, VIII, 85 (Jan., 1918).

[3] For the divisions and nomenclature, see Preface, p. vi.

III the discussion of Mt's rearrangement here of the Markan order, from which he scarcely deviates throughout the rest of the Gospel, we may now turn to his peculiar use of the Roman Gospel which he has made the framework for his entire work.

This arrangement has been exhibited at length with accurate statistics in the volume of *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem* edited by Canon Sanday (1911) [4] but may be restated more conveniently and briefly in the following extract from P. A. Micklem (*Westminster Commentary*, 1917, p. xx. f.).

> In Mt's use of Mk, it may especially be noted that
>
> (a) he incorporates nearly the whole of it: the omissions consisting only of seven subsidiary sections (1:23–28, 35–39; 4:26–29; 7:32–37; 8:22–26; 9:38–40; 12:41–44): and presumably being made either for the sake of abbreviation or because of some quality which from Mt's standpoint made them unsuitable for inclusion.
>
> (b) Mt largely rearranges Mk's order. This rearrangement is specially noticeable in Mk 1–6=Mt 3–13:58, after which Mk's order is followed with more or less of closeness.
>
> One instance of this rearrangement will suffice. In chh. 8, 9 Mt has grouped together a number of our Lord's works of healing without regard to their chronological order. The following table will show how in this section he has used in the main Marcan material but completely rearranged it.
>
> | | |
> |---|---|
> | The leper | Mt 8: 1– 4=Mk 1:40–44 |
> | The centurion's servant | 5–13 not in Mk |
> | Peter's mother-in-law | 14–17=1:29–31 |
> | The tempest and Gadarene demoniac | 23–34=4:35–5:20 |
> | Paralytic at Capernaum | 9: 1– 8=2:1–12 |
> | Jairus' daughter and woman with issue | 18–26=5:22–43 |
> | The two blind men | 27–31 not in Mk |
> | The dumb demoniac | 32 f. not in Mk |
>
> (c) Mt largely conflates or groups together material derived from varied sources or from varied parts of the same source.
>
> Mt 10, the charge to the disciples, furnishes an example:
>
> | | |
> |---|---|
> | Call and naming of the disciples | Mt 10: 1– 5=Mk 3:13–19 |
> | Original charge and mission | 7–15=6:7–13 |
> | Additional directions | 16–42 from non-Marcan sources |
>
> It may be noted in passing that in regard to all the points above noted Lk differs from Mt in his use of the second Gospel. He omits much more than Mt, follows Mk's order far more closely, and generally speaking follows one source only at a time.

[4] See especially pp. 145–151.

(d) Mt largely abbreviates Marcan narratives and makes changes both in incidental details and in phraseology in accordance with his own literary style and stage of reflection. The following passage will serve to illustrate Mt's use of Mk in these respects:

Mt 8:23–27	Mk 4:35–41
18 ***Now when Jesus saw great multitudes about him, he gave commandment to depart to the other side.***	35 And on that day, when even was come, he saith unto them, Let us go over unto the other side.
23 ***And when he was entered into a boat, his disciples followed him.***	36 And leaving the multitude, they take him with them, even as he was, in the boat. **And other boats were with him.**
24 And ***behold,*** there arose a great ***tempest*** in the sea, insomuch that the boat ***was covered*** with the waves: but he was asleep.	37 And there ariseth a great storm of wind, and the waves **beat into the boat,** insomuch that the boat was now filling.
25 And they ***came to him*** and awoke him, saying, ***Save, Lord: we perish.***	38 And he himself was **in the stern** asleep **on the cushion:** and they awake him, and say unto him, Master, carest thou not that we perish?
26 And he saith unto them, Why are ye fearful, ***O ye of little faith?*** Then he arose, and rebuked the winds and the sea; and there was a great calm.	39 And he awoke and rebuked the wind, and **said unto the sea, peace, be still. And the wind ceased,** and there was a great calm.
	40 And he saith unto them, Why are ye fearful? Have ye not yet faith?
27 ***And the men marvelled,*** saying, ***What manner of*** man is this, that even the winds and the sea obey him?	41 And they feared exceedingly and said one to another, Who, then, is this, that even the wind and the sea obey him?

The words in bold-face italics denote changes in details of incident and in phraseology made by Mt.

The bold-face roman type denotes details in Mk omitted by Mt.

We note (a) that, as the incident is given a different setting in Mt from that in Mk, the introduction is changed to mark the change of circumstance—*cf.* Mt 8:18 with Mk 4:35.

(b) that certain details in Mk, which add picturesque colour to the narrative but no more, are omitted by Mt for the sake of abbreviation. The presence of the other boats 36, the place in the boat where the Lord lay asleep 38, the direct address to the sea 39, are omitted in Mt's more concise account.

(c) that Mt adds "behold" 24, "came to" 25, phrases characteristic of him.

(d) that Mt makes changes out of reverence partly for our Lord, and partly for the disciples. In Mk verses 35 f. the embarking and crossing

are proposed, not commanded, by our Lord, while the disciples take the initiative in action almost forcible. In Mt verses 18, 23 our Lord is supreme. He gives the command, and after being the first to embark is followed by his disciples. Again the half-reproachful "carest thou not . . .," Mk 38, becomes in Mt a cry for help, "Save, Lord," 25. So again the character and behavior of the disciples is set in a better light in Mt than in Mk. The direct rebuke, "Have ye not yet faith?", Mk 40, becomes the characteristic Matthean phrase "O ye of little faith," 26; the words "feared exceedingly," 41, are toned down to the less reproachful "marvelled," 27.

The effect of this concise and conservative statement will be heightened by a few supplementary observations under each of its four heads.

(a) The "seven" omissions of subsidiary sections from Mk will be further reduced in number, and the significance of the one or two which are really such will be enhanced, if it be observed that in almost every case the apparent omission can be accounted for, Mt having either compensated for it in some way, or else shown that he prefers a different version of the same anecdote, or has so thoroughly rewritten it as to lead many to overlook or deny a basic identity. The only one of the seven which gives color to the idea that it may have been absent from Mt's copy of Mk is the Widow's Mites (Mk 12:41–44). For the rest we note: (1) The abbreviation of Mk 1:16–39 in Mt 4:18–25, following $R^{mt's}$ general practice with narrative material, leads to the neglect of an exorcism (Mk 1:23–28) which to some extent duplicates Mk 5:1–20 = Mt 8:28–34. The view taken by Mk 1:34b, a view illustrated by the exorcism in question, is objectionable to Mt.[5] Nevertheless he compensates for the omission by doubling the exorcism of Mk 5:1–20 = Mt 8:28–34. The night retirement of Jesus after the opening Sabbath in Capernaum conflicts with Mt's idea of the use of miracle and could be regarded as unimportant.

(2) The Parable of the Patient Husbandman (Mk 4:26–29) is not "omitted" by Mt but rewritten in the same relative position, to inculcate a lesson of peculiar interest to himself.[6] The motive of the added feature of the "tares," with parallels demonstrating that Mt himself is responsible for the change, is set forth in our chapter introductory to Book III.

(3) Mk 7:32–37 and 8:22–26 constitute a pair of typically Markan elaborations of the therapeutic method of Jesus. In such cases Mt invariably abbreviates.[7] But for these omissions also he compensates, if, indeed, we should not rather say he recognizes and avoids a

[5] See my article "The Markan Theory of Demonic Recognition of the Christ" in *ZNW*.VI (1905), pp. 153–158.

[6] *Cf. OS*, p. 432, note 3.

[7] On this point *cf.* Allen, *ICC*, p. xxxii. f.

Markan duplication. In *GM* (1925, p. 162 f.) I have shown that both Mt and Lk betray a certain consciousness of this duplication. Mt, as usual, clings much more closely to Mk, omitting only the companion healings of 7:32–37 and 8:22–26; whereas Lk passes over Mk 6:45–8:26. But in 9:27–34 Mt again makes his curious compensation by reduplication. Jesus now heals *two* blind men. In 12:22, the Q equivalent of Mk 7:32–37, the healing of the dumb man is also related, but with the addition that he was also "blind."

(4) Mk 9:38–40 is a striking instance of substitution rather than omission. The logion of verse 40 is reproduced in the Q form (Mt 12:30=Lk 11:23), which Mk inverts. The doctrine of toleration which Mk supports (wonder-working in the name of Jesus by outsiders not to be opposed) is emphatically condemned by Mt 7:21–23. The passage is rewritten by Mt from Q material with especial reference to his *bête noire*, the wonder-working "false prophets." Acts 18:13–20 shows a similar reaction on Lk's part toward the "false prophets" who exorcise by the name of Jesus, coupling them with the users of "Ephesian letters," or magic spells. Mk agrees rather with Paul (Phil 1:18).

The only remaining instance of omission by Mt of Markan material is that of the Widow's Mites, Mk 12:41–44, a disconnected anecdote of Lukan type attached to the phrase "widows' estates" in Mk 12:40. Some reason exists for thinking this a tradition of the Jerusalem "elders" related in *Ev. Hebr.* along with that of the Woman taken in Adultery.[8] It is possible, therefore, that Mk 12:41–44 may be a later attachment to the second Gospel which failed to make its way into the text employed by Mt. We may of course disregard the late texts which insert Mk 12:40=Lk 20:47 as Mt 23:14.

(b) As will appear in our chapter introductory to Book II the group of Ten Mighty Works in Mt in 8 f. is compiled with reference to the Charge to the Twelve which follows in ch. 10, because these are sent forth to preach *and to heal* (10:1). For the detail of Mt's arrangement the reader may also consult my article "Editorial Arrangement in Mt 8–9" (*Expositor*, XIX, Eighth Series, 111, March, 1920, pp. 200–218). The displacement of the Markan section Mt 12:1–14=Mk 2:23–3:6 is of course due to the fact that this portion of Mk's group illustrating the Growth of Hostility (Mk 2:1–3:6) is better adapted to Mt's narrative section introductory to the Hiding of the Mystery of the Kingdom than to that which introduces the Charge to the Twelve. Apart from the composition of these two groups, the narrative introduction to Book II, mainly based on Mk, and that to Book III, mainly based on S, Mt makes no material change in the order of Mk.

[8] See Appended Note VI.

(c) Mt's agglutinations, or "conflation" of "material derived from varied sources or from varied parts of the same source," should perhaps be regarded as an exception to the statement just made as to Matthean changes in the order of Mk. The two instances cited by Micklem (Mt 10:1–5 and 7–15=Mk 3:13–19 and 6:7–13) would inevitably form part of the Mission of the Twelve (discourse of Book II) for any compiler aiming to form such a group. The process is abundantly illustrated in the discourse of Book I, mainly formed from S^q teachings derived from various contexts preserved in Lk. We could hardly expect Mt not to subject Markan discourse to similar rearrangement. However, the remaining discourses of Mt (Book III, Mt 13; Book IV, Mt 18, and Book V, Mt 23–25) make no change in the order of Mk.

(d) The abbreviation of the narrative material of Mk in favor of discourse, whether derived from Mk or S, is easily verified from any synopticon. Micklem's example from Mt 8:23–27=Mk 4:35–41 is well chosen for the purpose specified. It shows not only the process of abbreviation, but the great freedom of change "in incidental details and in phraseology" which Mt permits himself merely to bring Mk's language into "accordance with his own literary style and stage of reflection." The selection is less well adapted to exhibit the modification the later evangelist is able to accomplish, and actually permits himself, in the meaning itself by slight but skilfully applied touches of the pen.

For Mt is both skilful and bold in bringing out that which he regards as the truth of the matter. *Suaviter in modo, fortiter in re* appears to be his motto. For these far more important and significant changes the passage selected by Micklem falls decidedly short of supplying adequate examples. Allen (*ICC*, pp. xxxi.–xxxiii.) has furnished a long and convincing series of examples of "alterations which seem due to an increasing feeling of reverence for the person of Christ," and has followed this (pp. xxxiii.–xxxv.) with an account of "similar alterations in favour of the disciples," then of "alterations due to a desire to emphasize a fulfilment of prophecy," then of "changes or brief insertions made to qualify or explain the meaning" of Mk, or "for the sake of greater accuracy," including several "changes in point of fact." Allen has the aim of "convincing the reader that of the two Gospels, that of Mk is primary, that of Mt secondary." Our own readers may be assumed to need no further convincing on this score. It will be of greater interest to observe from an example scarcely touched upon by Allen and often wholly disregarded, how large liberty Mt permits himself in changes of doctrinal sense.

We have seen above that "substitution" rather than "omission" is the proper term to apply to Mt 7:21–23 in relation to Mk 9:38–40.

It has also been pointed out in a previous volume (*BGS*, p. 90) how by a minute touch in 15:22 Mt eliminates the whole (unhistorical) journey of Jesus into Gentile territory, a feat more drastically accomplished by Lk by cancellation of the entire section Mk 6:45–8:26. The following example will illustrate how by unobtrusive alterations Mt succeeds not merely in removing an utterance of apparent self-depreciation placed by Mk in the mouth of Jesus, but (far more significant!) in reversing the sense of Mk's teaching that Pharisean obedience to the commandment, however lovable in itself, gives no real claim to "eternal life."

Of course Mt does not assert that obedience to the Old Testament law is sufficient, but he does make Jesus teach that by adding together "old and new" (*cf.* 13:52) this end may be attained on the typically Pharisean plan, obedience plus "good works." As before, we print in bold-face italics the changes of Mt, some of which effect only abbreviation, improvement of style, conformation of Scripture quotations to the Septuagint text, etc., but some go deeper.

Mk 10:17–22

And as he was going forth into the way a man ran up and fell on his knees and asked him, Good teacher, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? But Jesus said to him, Why callest thou me "good"? There is none "good" but One even God. Thou knowest the commandments, Commit no adultery, commit no murder, commit no theft, bear no false witness, commit no fraud, honor thy father and thy mother. But he said to him, Teacher, all these things I have observed from my youth. And Jesus looked upon him and loved him and said to him, One thing thou lackest. Go, sell all that thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven, and come, follow me. And his face fell at the saying, and he went away grieved, for he was one that had great possessions.

Mt 19:16–22

And ***lo,*** a man ***came up*** and said to him, Teacher, what ***good thing*** shall I do that I may ***have*** eternal life? But he said to him: Why ***askest thou me concerning that which is good?*** One there is who is "good." ***But if thou wouldest enter into life, keep the commandments. Of what sort, said he. And Jesus said,*** The commandments ***Thou shalt*** not kill, ***thou shalt*** not commit adultery, ***thou shalt*** not steal, ***thou shalt*** not bear false witness, honor thy father and thy mother, ***and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.*** The youth saith to him, I have kept all these; ***what lack I yet?*** Jesus said to him, Go, sell all that ***belongs*** to thee and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven, and come, follow me. But when the youth heard it he went away grieved, for he was one that had great possessions.

Allen and others naturally call attention to the change in verses 16 f. by which Mt escapes the implication of Mk that Jesus disap-

proved the application to himself of the epithet "good." These critics properly enough class this change with others which show an "increased feeling of reverence." But too little attention is paid to the changes in the rest of the paragraph, although, as already pointed out, these invert the more Pauline doctrine of Mk that "eternal life" is *not* the prize of obedience and good works but of self-surrender without reserve after the example of Christ. Mt's change produces a neo-legalistic doctrine which only differs from that of the scribes and Pharisees by the substitution of a "righteousness" which "exceeds" theirs by greater inwardness and greater emphasis on "good works." This doctrinal change is the more significant for our present enquiry because we have the good fortune to possess a fragment of the *Ev. Naz.* preserved in the translation of Origen's *Comm. in Mt* (XV, 14).[9] Here this same Markan narrative of the Rich Enquirer is altered in precisely the same direction. For the midrashic additions which we print in bold-face Roman type in the extract have no other object than to make clear the teaching that *if* the enquirer had really "kept the Law and the Prophets" instead of neglecting the "good works" they inculcate toward his "brethren," all would have been well.

> Another rich man said to him, Master, what good thing shall I do to have life? He said to him: Man, obey the Law and the Prophets. He answered him, I have done so. He said to him, Go, sell all that thou hast and distribute it to the poor and come, follow me. ***But the rich man began to scratch his head, and it did not please him. And the Lord said to him, How sayest thou, "I have obeyed the Law and the Prophets"; whereas it is written in the Law, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself; and lo, many of thy brethren, the sons of Abraham, are clothed with filthy garments, dying of hunger, and thy house is full of many good things, and nothing whatsoever goes forth from it to them.*** And turning to Simon his disciple sitting beside him he said, Simon, son of John, it is easier for a camel to enter through the eye of a needle than a rich man into the kingdom of heaven.

We cannot claim dependence on the part of Mt from this Nazarene version of the story, because the points of resemblance in style "Simon, son of John" Mt 16:17, "kingdom of *heaven*," "lo," "Law and Prophets" as in Mt 7:12, etc.), with others which recall one of Lk's sources (the address "Man"; *cf.* Lk 6:4 β text; "sons of Abraham," Lk 13:16; 19:9, etc.) are indicative rather of dependence in the reverse direction. As Mt has rewritten Mk so the Nazarene Gospel has rewritten Mt. But the freedom displayed in this targumic rendering, joining the story to some other (that of Lk 16:19 ff. ?) and

[9] The translator has probably taken the extract from Jerome. See Appended Note VI.

manipulating it with sole reference to the moral lesson, proves at least that down to this second-century date Aramaic-speaking Christians of the region of Aleppo were still composing such writings, and that their neo-legalistic conception of gospel teaching was identical with that of our first evangelist.

CHAPTER VII

THE EXTENT OF Q

Two points already established will make it easier now to approach the difficult and disputed question of Mt's second source of material, much of which is shared by Lk. The chapters introductory to his several "books" will afford opportunity to enquire in further detail as to the particular contents and order of this source, or these sources; whether Lk has another, or others, unknown to Mt, etc. For the present we consider only the use Mt makes of S^q.

The common attempt to connect this "double-tradition" material with the witness of Papias has been shown to be fallacious. Consequently we are free from all preconceptions regarding its nature. No sufficient reason exists for holding that it consisted of short sayings loosely connected (logia). We only know that both Mt and Lk employ it mainly to supply the Markan defect of teaching material. The fact that both these, but especially Mt, have made the narrative of Mk fundamental, dovetailing in the supplementary S material, merely shows that Mk enjoyed for both transcribers a certain (Petrine?) authority which made supplementation of its *narrative* from non-apostolic sources relatively inadvisable.

On the other hand much of the Q material does consist of discourse introduced by a very slender thread of narrative, as in the case of the "dialogues" of the fourth Gospel, the speeches of Peter in Acts 1–15, and those of the same apostle in the *Clementina*. Moreover, it should be recognized that the discourses of S^q have the same "atomic" structure as the discourses of Mk 4, 9, and 13, and still more conspicuously those of Mt and Lk; that is, they consist of agglutinated logia, often strung together *ad vocem* rather than as logic and intrinsic sense require. In other words the "*Spruchsammlung*," or collection of loosely attached sayings, is the earlier type, not far removed from catechetic oral tradition; and this earlier method of agglutination actually survived as late as the formation of the Oxyrhynchus collection of Λόγοι. The composition of discourses by agglutination of such "sayings," an advance from *Spruchsammlung* to *Redesammlung*, is the later process illustrated in different lines of development by Mk, Mt, Lk, and Jn. But the object in view was not always the same. Mt's discourses aimed at "commandments" grouped topically, Lk's at the pictorial or biographic ideal of διατριβαί on subjects of moral and religious interest.

It is quite natural, expecially for critics who believe that the expression *σύνταξις τῶν λογίων* applied by Papias to Mt in distinction from Mk can be transferred in some way to S, or who wish to carry back the composition of S to the earliest possible date, to make the utmost of the "atomic" structure of S^q, and even to apply to this material the question-begging designation "*Spruchsammlung*." Thus even Wernle not only (a) applies the term *Spruchsammlung* (=*σύνταξις τῶν λογίων*), but (b) reasons from it that narrative elements such as the Baptism and Preaching of John must be later additions. Wernle differentiates, therefore, Q from Q′, Q″, etc., on the ground that the original document consisted exclusively of brief logia (*SF*, p. 225):

> The sayings mentioned (Markan logia such as Mk 1:40–3:6; 3:31–4:9; 12:13–44; Parousia sayings in Mk 13) are incongruous in the *Spruchsammlung* because of their narrative, anecdotal character. These are no agglutinations of sayings, like all the discourses in Q, but in every case single short logia which form the nucleus of little stories, with introduction, appeal to Jesus, and close. Compare with this the discourses on Filial Righteousness, on Confession, on the Baptist, etc. The story of the Centurion obtained a place in Q only because of the important series (?) of logia at its close. Only in proportion as this distinction between anecdotes and discourses is observed or not is it possible to form a clear conception of Q.

If even Wernle, who rejects the Papias-Logia theory, can employ such circuitous reasoning as this it should cause no surprise to find the same reasoning, even to the use of the same examples in identical phraseology, in Harnack and Hawkins, both of whom approve a modified form of Schleiermacher's delusive theory.

But the real question is not whether discrete *λόγοι* be not the older type of transmission; nor whether the S^q discourses, like all others known to us, give evidence of building up by agglutination; both these points are irrelevant. The real question is: To what extent does the Q material indicate that the agglutinative process had advanced in S? This question can be answered only by scrutiny of the Q material itself, whose contents must be listed. For while many partially satisfactory lists have been made many are also vitiated by false methods of construction.

For present purposes it is unnecessary to go back to the earlier attempts at reconstruction of S described and tabulated by Moffatt (*Introd.*, pp. 194–206). Any unprejudiced comparison of the sixteen will suffice to show that the difficulties in the way are great, though perhaps not insurmountable as Burkitt declares.[1] At least it is possible by careful comparison of the editorial methods of Mt and Lk as

[1] *GHTr*, p. 17.

applied to Mk to see "what inferences as to the nature and contents of" (S) can be drawn from the Q material. It is this "more humble and limited task" to which Sir J. C. Hawkins has set his ripe skill in the essay entitled "Probabilities as to the so-called Double Tradition of Mt and Lk" (*OS*, pp. 96–138).

For the contents of Q the tabulation of Sir John under three divisions A, B, and C, of the 84 passages which have greater or less claim to the designation, must supersede the rougher lists of Wernle and Harnack. Class A includes no less than 54 "passages very probably derived from" S, Class B 22 "passages ascribable to Q with a considerable amount of probability" (marked with an obelus in later references), and Class C 8 "passages the origin of which in Q is but slightly probable." These eight are marked with a double obelus. Sir John finds natural satisfaction in the close agreement of his list with that of Harnack in *Btr. II* published after his own was already typed. Nevertheless the particular feature in which these two coincide as against Wernle's more general list (p. 224), or indeed most of those tabulated by Moffatt, represents a weakness of method found in both, a weakness which is the defect of its merit. The method aims at objectivity, and to avoid all subjective judgments uses for its classification of A, B, and C the somewhat mechanical standard of word-counting. Hawkins employs for the purpose Rushbrook's Greek *Synopticon*, making coincidence of language the primary test, with subordinate consideration of collocation and resemblance of substance.

The method is characteristic of this painstaking, modest, and cautious author. It won the outspoken admiration of Harnack, as it wins our own, because the basic facts must be such as permit of exact measurement. By such definite arithmetical data futile appeals to the obsolete theory of oral transmission and the no less obsolete theory of Lukan dependence on Mt are definitively barred. It is no longer possible to explain the sections of S^q showing close verbal similarity by direct dependence of Lk upon Mt, or vice versa, while falling back on oral transmission to explain the rest. The steady, inexorable logic of Wernle and Harnack, establishes first the mutual independence of Mt and Lk, then, as an unavoidable corollary, their use in common of a single Greek document (or possibly more than one) to supply the deficiency of Mk on the score of teaching material.

The use of the objective, statistical measuring rod is the strong point of Sir John, and it is used by both himself and Harnack with fatal results to the moribund oral-tradition and Lukan-dependence theories. Particularly is Harnack's discussion effective in showing that the Q material represents at least one individual Greek docu-

ment, inclusive of the greater part of S^q, having clearly definable characteristics of its own. Nevertheless this statistical measuring rod has its limitations, as Sir John himself is prompt to acknowledge.

The volume of *OS* finely illustrates the characteristic motto of English scholarship *audi alteram partem.* Minority reports are admitted from members of the Oxford group who dissent from the majority. The most important of these is contributed by Prof. Vernon Bartlet, who demurs to the *Spruchsammlung* theory and endeavors to obtain a hearing for a view more consonant with those of B. Weiss and the present writer. This will be considered in Chapter VIII. Less important, yet having a significance we cannot disregard, is the rejoinder of Allen to his critical opponents.

We have seen above that the attempt of Allen to account for S^q partly by a revived oral tradition theory, partly by direct dependence of Lk on Mt, breaks down. The force of his opposition is felt only as a protest against the method of determining S.

Both Hawkins and Harnack divided the Q parallels into classes by the word-counting method to avoid subjectivity of judgment. A striking result is that both throw doubt on three sections two of which Wernle had included as "certainly" (*sicher*) from S. Harnack places by themselves as doubtful the two parables of the Slighted Invitation [2] and Entrusted Funds (Mt 25:14–29 = Lk 19:12–26), Hawkins places the latter in his Class B and groups the Slighted Invitation and the saying on the Effect of the Baptist's Preaching (Mt 21:31 f. = Lk 7:29 f.) under Class C!

We have already seen why Mt and Lk diverge widely in their transcription of the Slighted Invitation. Any standard of measurement beyond the merely mechanical one of word-counting would give a similar result in the case of the Entrusted Funds. Wernle and Harnack are also clearly right in including the Effects of the Baptist's Preaching as true Q material in spite of verbal differences obviously arising from difference of setting. A similar instance is the saying on Thrones of Judgment, quite recast by Mt in 19:28, but surely the same saying as Lk 22:28–30. In short, some account must be taken of motives and methods affecting our two transcribers, which make them, each in his own way, something more than mere copyists. Mt in particular shows by his treatment of Mk that he can use on occasion the broadest freedom of recasting and relocation. It is due to overemphasis of the mechanical side in transcription, with failure to appreciate the liberties of recasting and supplementation which Mt and Lk have allowed themselves, liberties which at the same time can be checked and discounted by study of their respective motives and methods, that unnecessary difficulties have

[2] Above, p. 65 f.

been thrown in the way of the reconstruction of S. In particular we must lay it to this cause that Streeter feels obliged to assume a complete new document M in addition to the element N (treated separately by Streeter) and to Mk and S, in order to account for the wider variations of Mt from Lk in the Q material.[3]

Allen's objection, then, to the standard of measurement is partly justified. The expectation that in utilizing documents writers who stand in such relation to their sources as Mt and Lk will invariably make a verbally coincident transcript is not justified. These writers stand too near the period of dependence on living oral tradition to act as mere copyists. There will indeed be *enough* verbal transcription where any document of considerable extent is utilized to enable the critic in cases of independent parallelism to prove, as Wernle, Harnack, and Hawkins *have* proved, that the parallelism is due to the use of a common document S.[4] But the parallelism *will not be equally close in all parts* for the reasons illustrated in Mt's treatment of Mk.

Certain *kinds* of change will indeed be approximately uniform in all parts, as when both Mt and Lk make changes throughout for the improvement of style and rhetorical form, not infrequently coinciding in some small correction. But changes affecting the substance do not occur in all parts alike. They occur only in such passages as awaken the special interests of the transcribers. Moreover, the transcribers' motives being diverse, changes will be limited to groups of passages of a certain kind, Mt interposing at one point, Lk at another.

Again, it is a universally recognized phenomenon that the transcriptional changes affect narrative more than discourse, so that as a rule Mt and Lk show less divergence in their Q material than their Mk material. This may be in part because of the reverence felt for all words of Jesus even when reported at second hand; in part it is due also to the fact that both transcribers use S for the sake of its teaching material, and, finding this, have less motive for change. Mk, who uses to some extent the same material, makes far greater change, because his object is different. Again relocation, especially of short sections, will lead to a larger relative amount of verbal change.

As we have seen, and as Wernle had observed in more than one connection, *parable is to be classed with narrative rather than with discourse in the degree of exemption from transcriptional change.* The reason is simple. Parable, from its very nature as illustrative fiction, suggests freedom of adaptation to the lesson in view. To it applies the Synagogue rule which gives large liberty to *haggada* ("narrative"),

[3] See Appended Note VIII.

[4] See Burkitt's caution against "vague talk about the marvellous achievements of Oriental memories" (*GHTr*, p. 145).

as against *halacha* ("walk," *i.e.*, ethics, conduct of life), for only "commandments" require the maximum of precision and authority. In the case of anecdote or parable, the lesson in view being differently apprehended by different catechists, changes are made accordingly; usually (for the parables) in the direction of allegorization, or moralizing extension. An example of the Matthean use of both has already been furnished within the limits of a single parable, that of the Slighted Invitation.[5] We shall see reason presently to hold that the Matthean parables and smaller supplements not derived from Mk or S may often be ascribed to Mt's own rabbinic or catechetic resources, which of course include "things new and old" from both Synagogue and Church.

Allen's plea for oral tradition has, therefore, a certain validity against Harnack and Hawkins. In the period of Mt and Lk we must look for a partial survival of oral tradition side by side with use of S and Mk. Indeed the very familiarity of Mt and Lk with these written sources will tend to make their citations freer than otherwise. Who does not use greater freedom in transcribing a document whose contents are very familiar than one to which he is an entire stranger?

Our designation for oral tradition in Mt will be O, but it should be clearly understood that the symbol *does not exclude non-Christian material.* In application we must use greater freedom than Streeter, who in his *OS* article on "The Original Extent of Q" (VI, pp. 196–201) justly classes the two parables of the Slighted Invitation and the Entrusted Funds as Q. Mt has indeed "turned the (former) parable into allegory." It is also true that he "has appended as if it were part of the same parable 22:11–14, the Man without a Wedding Garment." But the attempt to connect this supplement with S, conjecturing reasons why it might have been omitted by Lk, is futile. As we have shown, the supplement merely attaches (very incongruously, but from characteristically Matthean motives) one of the commonplaces of rabbinic teaching credibly ascribed to Johanan ben Zacchai. Again, Streeter rightly rejects Harnack's attempt to find a combination of "two separate parables" in the Lukan form of the parable of the Entrusted Funds. He admits allegorization by Lk,[6] but shrinks from Wernle's frank recognition that Lk uses as much freedom as Mt or the *Ev. Naz.* in such "improvements."

In 19:11 Lk clearly states the lesson he finds in the parable. It is not that suggested by the parable itself. Why, then, should the critic throw upon Jesus responsibility for the present confused mixture of motives, rather than hold Lk responsible for "retelling a well-known incident in the life of Archelaus in such a way as to make (the

[5] Above, p. 65 f.

[6] See his footnote on p. 199.

parable) point a double moral"? Caution in treating as unauthentic any material transmitted by our evangelists is commendable, but conservatism may be carried to the extent of defeating its own ends. In treating such parables as the Slighted Invitation and the Entrusted Funds application may better be made of the principle none has better expressed than Streeter himself. (*OS*, p. 197):

> It seems not unreasonable to surmise that an editor would feel justified in taking more liberties with a parable than with a "commandment" of the Master, since its bearing lay not in its precise wording but in its general effect, and again more liberties than with the account of an action or scene in His life, drawn from Mk, since the scene or action of the parable was not supposed to be the description of an actual occurrence, and therefore to vary the details was not to distort history. Indeed this is not mere surmise, for Mt and Lk reproduce the Parables of the Sower and the Wicked Husbandmen with much less exactitude than they do such other utterances of our Lord as are given by Mk.

Comparison of Mt's method wlll show that we should extend the principle still further. Under the head of (1) Editorial allegorization (R) we must place the rewriting by Mt of the Mk parable of the Patient Husbandman (Mk 4:26–29). In the corresponding position of Mt 13:24–30 this becomes the parable of the Tares in the Wheat, presenting by means of its incongruous trait of the "enemy sowing tares" Mt's favorite moral of Judgment-sifting (*cf.* Mt 3:12=Lk 3:17 and Johanan ben Zacchai on Eccl. 9:8), in particular his habitual warning against the teachers of *ἀνομία*. But (2) we must further add under the designation O material such as Mt's general supplement to his last great discourse, pointing the moral of all the teachings. It is his closing description of the Last Judgment (25:31–46), improperly called the "parable" of the Sheep and the Goats because of a single incidental comparison. Even Allen (*ICC*, p. 266) admits that "this splendid ending of the long discourse (Mt 24 f.) reads like a Christian homily." It reads so because it is nothing else. Mt shows his idea of "the things which Jesus commanded" by composing as their climax a Christian homily on Judgment to Come of the type to be heard in many a Christian "synagogue" at the close of the first century (*cf.* Jas. 2:2 and 5:1–8). Study of what Mt rewrites and supplements in Mk is the best guide to his rewriting and supplementation of S; but study of his supplements, allegorizing changes, and moralizing applications at the close of each of the four preceding great Discourses should also guide our judgment in the case of the fifth and last. Oral tradition (including Synagogue homilies) supplies something of these supplementary exhortations to "good works" in view of coming reward or penalty; but motive, interest, and phrase-

ology alike point to our canonical evangelist himself as chief contributor.

What, then, are the limits of rewording and supplementation of discourses of Jesus by Mt and Lk? On this question we must observe the comment of Hawkins above cited based on the proleptic employments by Mt of Mk material. These anticipated passages show such mental mastery of the contents of Mk as would be impossible for an ancient writer unable to consult an index "unless he knew his material practically by heart." Undoubtedly he did. To Mt certainly, perhaps also to Lk, the contents of Mk and S were "known by heart," and could therefore be introduced at any point, with whatever verbal modification seemed advisable.

The weakness of any mere word-counting method for determining the extent of Q comes out very clearly when thus appraised. A wiser valuation of it is expressed in Burkitt's *GHTr*, where in the chapter on "The Teaching of Jesus Christ" (V, pp. 143–183) he uses the "doubly attested sayings" (*i.e.*, not Q but Mk plus S) to show that coincidence of wording was not regarded as essential to true witness in apostolic times, and need not be today. The portrait of Jesus is only marred when we introduce a standard devised to make the least possible concession from former claims of verbal inerrancy for our evangelists:

> The aim of the early Christians was practical; they aimed at making saints, not historians. The memory of Jesus survived among His servants, His presence was still felt in their midst, and we must be prepared beforehand to find that a clear distinction was not always drawn between what He would have said and what He really did say. "The laborer is worthy of his hire" (or "of his food") said Jesus, according to Mt and Lk; with S. Paul this has become the formal statement that the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel (I Cor. 9:14)—an example which clearly shews how sayings detached from a historical context harden into rules from which most of the distinctive phraseology of the speaker disappears. Another instance of the same kind is to be found in the Sayings about Divorce. In Mk 10:2–12 we have the whole story in its historical setting, and the saying of the Lord takes its color from the events of the age and the circumstances of the place where the saying was uttered. In Lk 16:18 we have much the same principle of conduct laid down, but the historical setting is gone: it belongs to Christian Ethics rather than to our Lord's Biography.

The distinction is the same to which we have drawn attention as current already in Papias' time between "gnomic" and "biographic" order. But the most important feature of Burkitt's observation lies in his correction of the disposition to undervalue coincidence in substance in comparison with coincidence which is merely verbal.

Our evangelists were justly conscious of being to some extent competent to tell what Jesus would have said, in addition to what he actually did say, and their report must be judged accordingly. The "double attestation material" adduced by Burkitt in a series of logia from Mk and S, of which the first two are Mk 3:4 (*copied* in Lk 6:19)=Lk 14:5 f. (*compare* Mt 12:11) and Mk 3:22–26=Lk 11:15–18 (*compare the non-Markan portions of* Mt 12:24–26), shows clearly enough the difference of design between S and Mk, a catechetic and a biographic compilation. Neither word-counting nor contextual position furnishes an adequate standard for determining the extent of Q if this distinction be ignored.

We must defer for a little our criticism of Streeter's answer to the question why Mt contains so relatively few of the "story-parables" of Lk in order to consider this scholar's treatment of another reservation of Harnack and Hawkins in their determination of the extent of Q. Both of these again list as very doubtful the Effect of the Baptist's Preaching (Mt 21:31b, 32=Lk 7:29 f.). The reason appears to be, partly, as before, insufficient agreement in language, but mainly difference in location. Hawkins himself, however, appears to have scruples about excluding this passage (*cf.* "f" on pp. 126 and 136), while Streeter, on grounds of Lukan collocation, declares Lk 6:20–7:35 to be "solid Q, with the one short interpolation, the Widow of Nain, 7:11–17." This time, clearly, the criterion to be tested is that of order. To what extent can we rely upon the principle enunciated by Burkitt and Streeter against Harnack, that "It is Lk rather than Mt who preserves the original order of his authorities, and his order is to be presumed as Q's (*i.e.*, S's) order unless for some special reason the contrary appears in some particular instance"?

The general demonstration of this proposition in Streeter's essay "On the Original Order of Q" (*OS*, pp. 141–164) is convincing. Mt's complete reallocation of the series of Mighty Works which forms the A division of Book II proves that this evangelist felt no scruples whatever about changes of order in Markan narrative. Moreover his motive was not better chronological sequence, but simple edification, a strong indication that Mt had not yet fully emerged from the period of oral preaching to which Papias refers. Of course if we go back *far enough* we shall undoubtedly reach a stage in the development of the record where the Q material stood in this disjointed sequence. But the question before us is not: Which of our two informants, Mt or Lk, shows the apostolic order and which is responsible for the dislocation? The question is: To what extent, and on what principle, has either of the two deviated from the non-apostolic source S in this respect? In the case of Mt the effort to produce a complete and "orderly" compend of the teachings has

entailed complete rearrangement of Markan narrative in the A division of Book II. It has also entailed rearrangement to even greater extent of the order of teaching material, whether from Mk or Q, to build up the five great discourses. For Mt has not scrupled to rearrange sections when, as in I, B, he made up the discourse from a single document. Lk's procedure as respects Mk was different. He interjects his Mk material in practically unaltered sequence in three considerable blocks. His Q material falls of course into the alternate blocks. Burkitt, followed by Hawkins and Streeter, infers from this general method that the Q blocks are left (with some exceptions) in the order of S. The inference is not warranted. Mk was a *διήγησις ἢ λεχθέντων ἢ πραχθέντων* like Lk's own. Even if Petrine authority did not weigh unduly upon an evangelist who seems to take *κατά* in the broader sense when considering Mk's relation to Peter, there was every reason why Lk should leave the order of Mk's narrative comparatively unchanged. But S was not a narrative (*διήγησις*) in any such sense as Mk. Its object, as critics agree, was chiefly didactic. It aimed to put together the teachings. Have we any reason then to assume that Lk made no attempt to improve upon the order of S? Is it not indeed more probable that Lk's predecessor, who compiled this S, had already rearranged the mass of current anecdotes still largely in oral form to suit *his* ideas of order? In short, we stand, once more, before the alternative of primitive conditions of "detached sayings and groups of sayings" in oral tradition or the developed conditions represented by our canonical Gospels. How far had S progressed toward the literary form when utilized in Greek dress by our two later evangelists?

Instead of starting with the proposition: "A mere *Spruchsammlung* (*σύνταξις τῶν λογίων*) *cannot* have had an order of any kind" we should disregard what Papias had to say about a *different writing*, and set ourselves to the task of ascertaining the actual order of S, remembering that there are two *types* of order, represented respectively by Mt and Lk, the gnomic and the biographic; and that the Gospel of Mk shows examples of both; for its narratives (as the Elder correctly maintained) are put together *πρὸς τὰς χρείας*, while its discourses (as clearly shown by their expansions in Mt II, B; III, B; IV, B; and V, B) represent an inchoate form of gnomic agglutination. This arrangement aims at convenience of religious instruction; sometimes it displays the typical rabbinic style of collocation *ad vocem*. If the precedent of Mk has any value we should expect Q (and consequently S) to show examples of *both* kinds of agglutination.

We have taken as an example of disagreement of the critics on this question of the value of collocation for determining the extent of Q the section on Effects of the Baptist's Preaching (Mt 21:31b f.

=Lk 7:29 f.). Wernle, most determined advocate of the *Spruchsammlung* theory, ignores this passage entirely, while Harnack and Hawkins rank it as B or C; but Burkitt at least sees no objection to it on the score of order, for in his chapter on "The Gospel in Mt and in Lk" (*GHTr*, pp. 184–217), after pointing out the freedom of Mt in recasting and supplementing the language of Mk, he continues with the following judicious characterization of Mt's method as regards order (p. 187):

> I do not think that Mt aimed at being a Chronicler. This statement would not be true of all the evangelists. Mk and Lk are, in a way, Chroniclers; that is, a very great part of their intention is to tell the story of the events more or less as they came to pass. With Mt the case is different.[7] He is not especially concerned to paint the most lifelike picture possible of Jesus of Nazareth as He walked the earth in what was, even when Mt wrote, a past age. His aim rather is to shew forth the real significance of One who had come in the fulness of time, fulfilling the ancient words of prophecy.

Another object of Mt, less generally appreciated than this, we have found to be at least equally significant for the criticism of this Gospel—the completion of Mk by adding the teachings arranged in gnomic order. But this order demanded drastic reallocation of the teaching material, whether Mk or S, a reallocation which Mt had no hesitation in effecting. Many before him may well have followed the same course with general approval. Thus Burkitt properly seconds Wellhausen's example of precanonical allocations on p. 52 of his *Ev. Lucae*.

> Wellhausen points out that the Parable of the Good Samaritan (Lk 10:29 ff., appended to the Great Commandment, Mk 12:32–34=Lk 10:25–28) is strictly speaking an answer to the question, "Whose neighbor am I?",[8] not to "Who is my neighbor?" . . . In either case the inconsequence remains. Wellhausen considers that the answer of the scribe and the Parable are really separate stories, which have been joined together by the Evangelist. The Parable has a Samaritan hero, consequently the Evangelist has placed the whole compilation in the Samaritan section of his Gospel; but the Lawyer who answers so well at first is only the scribe of Mk 12:30 ff. transferred to an earlier place, like the Sermon at Nazareth in Lk 4.

It is indeed quite evident both that *someone in the Lukan line of transmission* has effected in both these cases a different collocation

[7] In view of Prof. Burkitt's clear appreciation of the very distinction made by Papias it is surprising that he should so misapply what Papias has to say about the Matthean *σύνταξις τῶν λογίων* as to refer it to a collection of Old Testament *testimonia*.

[8] Better "Who is the best interpreter of the Law?" *Cf.* Jas. 3:13.

than Mk's, and (seemingly) *for catechetic purposes.* But to leap at once to the conclusion that Mk's order is historical, and that Lk, the evangelist whom our English critics are so keen to point out "keeps his Mk material in the original order where possible" is something of a *sault perilleux.* To this we must return; but first let us consider the example originally adopted, diversely valued as it is by the critics. The two methods of allocation will be best illustrated if we place Mt and Lk side by side, placing Lk as before in the left-hand column because

> the actual fact of the dislocation of Mk's order by Mt justifies us in paying very little attention to the order in which we find Sayings of Jesus grouped in Mt's Gospel (*GHTr*, p. 198):

Lk 7:29 f.	Mt 21:31b f.
And all the people when they heard it and the publicans justified God, for they had been baptized with the baptism of John. But the Pharisees and the lawyers set at naught God's counsel in their case, for they had not been baptized by him.	Jesus saith to them: Verily I say unto you, The publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of God before you. For John came unto you bringing justification, and the publicans and harlots believed on him, but ye, when ye saw it did not even repent yourselves afterwards to believe on him.

The treatment of the teaching of this Q passage in Lk is typical of the recasting which becomes unavoidable when passing from the gnomic to the biographic style of composition. Lk (or some predecessor) does with it precisely what Mk does with the Q discourse on the Baptism of John (Mt 11:2 ff.=Lk 7:18 ff.) in drawing from it his description of the Baptist's situation, garb, and diet (Mk 1:7 f.). We have three reasons for recognizing that in this case Mt's form is nearer the original, so far as text is concerned. (1) This is one of only four cases in his Gospel in which Mt retains unaltered (for reasons of sense) "the kingdom of God" instead of changing to "kingdom of heaven." (2) The collocation with the parable of The Repentant Younger Son is surely correct. This also, in the abbreviated form characteristic of the Matthean parable, will be from the same source. (3) The language, Semitic to the verge of unintelligibility (came to you "in a way," *i.e.*, "to bring," or "way"= *tarik*=mode of religious teaching; "righteousness," *i.e.*, "acquittal in the judgment," but *cf.* Lk "justified God") is Mattheanized, whereas in the Lukan form it is Lukanized (*cf. HS*, p. 17). But the magnet which has drawn the whole section Mt 21:28–32 to its present position is unmistakable. Mt as usual depends on Mk, who relates the whole debate in Mk 11:27–33, whether correctly or not,

as a sequel to the Purging of the Temple. Lk (or some predecessor) perceives its close relation to Jesus' denunciation of the Pharisees for turning a deaf ear to John. Biographic order therefore demanded that it be placed in the Galilean setting. The homiletic (gnomic) order followed by Mk placed the whole denunciation in Jesus' last public utterance. Mt as usual follows Mk. If only Mk's order were historically reliable! But that is exactly what ancient and modern criticism alike declare it is not. It is a collection of "sayings and doings" arranged in such order as homiletic edification required. Which order was that of S? We cannot treat either as apostolic and authoritative. We must do as all those in search of a biography have done before us since Mk first came into circulation—make such a *diegesis* as we are able by combination of Q and Mk. All we have to guide us is two different types of rearrangement.

Our criticism of the verbal and contextual standard of measurement for the extent of Q has considerably simplified the problem. All of the group classed as dubious by Harnack now take their place with the undisputed. All from Hawkins' Class C that the author himself deems worthy of serious consideration do the same with the exception of two brief logia. The saying on Savorless Salt (Mt 5:13 = Lk 14:34 f.) must be classed as "triple-tradition" (*i.e.*, Markan) material, since it occurs also in Mk 9:50. In that case it is not properly part of Q, though it may very well be from S, where it is placed by Burkitt along with other "doubly attested" material. Sir John's footnote *ad loc.* indicates his agreement with this verdict. The same judgment applies to the other logion "Giving Help on the Sabbath" (Mt 12:10 f. = Lk 14:2 f., 5). This Burkitt (*GHTr*, p. 148) places first in his list of "doubly attested" sayings. Once more we have probable derivation from S, though improper classification as Q.

Nothing remains of Class C save four parallels (?) whose real function appears to be a *reductio ad absurdum* of the verbal-agreement standard from Mt's Preamble (chh. 1–2 compared with Lk 1-3). Of these Hawkins himself observes that they "may be omitted from further consideration, as being quite unlikely to have been in any degree grounded on Q." Since no one of the sixteen reconstructors of S tabulated by Moffatt includes them, the reader can only ask why Sir John introduces them at all. The reason appears in the note accompanying the last of the Class C passages we have to consider. Sir John also classes as a possible Q parallel (C, 5) "Recompense for alms, or for hospitality" comparing Mt 6:3 f. with Lk 14:13 f., but with the comment "But the resemblances are very slight, and the passages are only inserted in order not to omit altogether any verbal parallel suggested in (Rushbrook's) *Synopticon*." The standard of verbal identity for determining the extent of Q

may demonstrate (in this case somewhat superfluously) the objectivity of the critic, but when mechanically applied (as where in No. 1 thirteen names in the Genealogy of Jesus are counted as "coincidences of language" between Q^{mt} and Q^{lk}) the result is mere absurdity.

The general outcome of *OS.* in the attempt to define the relation of Mt to Q is that Mt in comparison with Lk stands much nearer to Mk. His text is generally closer than Lk's to the original when he transcribes sections of Q, but is also much more apt to be conflated with Mk. As regards order Mt again follows the example of Mk. He constructs discourses by free agglutination, rearrangement, supplementation, drawing from both Mk and S. He also constructs groups of anecdotes according to his own conception of an effective order. In these also Mk and S are intertwined. I, B consists of a discourse formed from Q material rearranged and stripped of the narrative introductions found in Lk; III, A consists almost wholly of Q material presented in narrative form. Q, therefore, does represent a single real document S, but for the nature and structure of S there must be further comparison of Lukan with Matthean employment. In particular a hearing must be given to the representative of another school of criticism which questions the assumption that S was "not a gospel," accounting otherwise for the predominance of teaching material in the Q extracts which survive. If the two Weiss', father and son, Burkitt, Bartlet and the present writer are not deceived S, when in the hands of Mt and Lk, if not of Mk also, had already advanced beyond the stage of the mere structureless collection of "sayings and doings of the Lord" toward that of the biographic record, connecting agglutinated discourses by a slender thread of narrative outline. This criticism of the order of Q must be the subject of a new chapter.

CHAPTER VIII

MATTHEAN OMISSIONS

It would be easy at this point to transgress the proper limits of Studies in Mt to enter the domain of Studies in the Synoptic Problem. A chapter on the Contents of S would logically follow that of the Extent of Q if the object in view were determination of the nature and structure of the Second Source. But our line of approach to this ulterior problem demands limitation for the present to Mt.

The uniform conclusion of contributors to *OS* points to Lk rather than Mt as more nearly reflecting both character and contents of S. Mt stands in much closer relation to Mk, whether conflation of individual passages be considered, or proportionate mass of incorporation. Lk incorporates little more than half of Mk, Mt practically the whole. Lk interjects his blocks of Mk almost without change of order, Mt interweaves small bits of Mk throughout his Gospel and in chh. 4–14 makes havoc of Mk's order. Lk cancels the entire section of Mk on Jesus in Gentile regions (Mk 6:45–8:26), preferring his own more historical account in Acts of the extension of the gospel to the Gentiles. Mt corrects the error by a few minute changes in Mk's text to indicate that Jesus had never transgressed his own rule "Go not into any way of the Gentiles." Lk almost entirely supersedes Mk's Passion story by another of unknown origin, in many respects historically superior. Mt clings closer than ever to Mk, making no changes of order and adding nothing of value. His rare and brief supplements are of a highly apocryphal character dominated by anti-Pharisaic polemic [1] and quite impossible to associate with S.

All this raises in acute form the question of the character and contents of S. But it shows still more clearly that the question can only be answered after such study of sources and editorial methods of Lk as we have just applied to those of Mt. Such study has been given by several of the contributors to *OS*, and by Burkitt, as well as by the German critics already mentioned. In particular the question of Lk's order in the Q passages has been discussed by the present writer also in a series of articles in the *JBL* (XXXIV–XXXVII, 1915–1917) under the title "The 'Order' of the Lukan 'Interpolations.'" This study led to the conviction that Lk employs in the

[1] See *e.g.*, Mt 27:24 f., 62–66; 28:11–15.

make-up of these "interpolations" another non-Markan source besides S, for which the designation L has been commonly employed since the publication in 1891 of P. Feine's *Vorkanonische Ueberlieferung des Lukas in Evangelium und Apostelgeschichte.* Streeter's restatement of the theory of L has brought it recently into new prominence. Now if in addition to S Luke has mingled L factors in his blocks of non-Markan material, whether L was already combined with S or conflated with it by Lk himself, a new factor of great importance will be added to the problem. This will be still further complicatd by the question what relation L will have borne, if any, to Mk. No wonder critics find it hard to reach a unanimous verdict if this be so, and Lk's reference to "many" predecessors in his work of drawing up a narrative (διήγησις) of the things concerning Jesus suggests at least one "narrative" in addition to Mk and S. Under these circumstances our Studies in Mt must leave discussion of Lk's sources and editorial methods to others. The theory of L is discussed in recent commentaries such as Preuschen's (1912), Loisy's (1920), and B. S. Easton's (1926). It comes more into the foreground in critical studies such as Wellhausen's *Evangelium Lucae* (1904), B. Weiss' *Quellen des Lk-evangelium's* (1908), and Vincent Taylor's *Behind the Third Gospel, a Study of the Proto-Lk Hypothesis* (1926), not to mention the four *Btr.* of Harnack.

On the other hand Studies in Mt cannot disregard the careful observations of Burkitt's *GHTr*, nor those of Hawkins, Streeter, and Vernon Bartlet in *OS* comparing redactional methods of Mt and Lk. For, as between Q, S, and L, the issue turns primarily on these methods.

Professor Bartlet, with many others, holds to a proto-Lk theory. In his view the document S, when it came into the hands of Lk, had already been expanded by the addition of new narratives such as the Widow of Nain, and many "story" parables. But the characteristics of this L [2] document are too intensely Jewish to permit its being ascribed to the Gentile Lk. Hence the dubious expedient of supposing it to have been a "private" compilation made for Lk's benefit at Caesarea perhaps by "Philip the evangelist," which Lk took over without change of its Semitic style.

The subject of omissions by Mt from S is systematically discussed by Hawkins on p. 122 f. of *OS*. In answer to the question whether S contained "introductions" to its sayings of Jesus he points out (i) that "some sayings certainly had them, inasmuch as "in two

[2] Bartlet uses the designation S (Special Source). The singularity is unfortunate in view of the general employment of L by so many who take a similar view. My own employment of S for the *Second* Source can only be with apologies to Prof. Bartlet, but is perhaps excusable in the interest of clarity.

or three instances Mt and Lk retain sayings and introductions together." Again:

> (ii) No such decided inference can be drawn as to the sayings for which we find introductions supplied by Lk only, as in 11:1–13, 37–52; 12:13–34; 13:23–27; 15:1–7; 17:20–27 and 34, 35, 37, while only the sayings contained in those passages are given by Mt in one or other of his large bodies of discourse with more or less appropriateness to its general subject. It is easy to say with Loisy and others that Lk "readily invents the surroundings of the discourses that he repeats"; and it may be admitted that his desire to place things as far as possible "in order" may have caused him sometimes to adopt without sufficient authority historical occasions which seemed to him suitable for the separate sayings which he wished to locate somewhere. But judging from the evidence before us in the two Gospels, I cannot think that this chronological tendency in Lk was nearly so strong and effective as the homiletical tendency in Mt to group sayings according to their subjects, and so according to their convenience for teachers. And therefore it seems to me probable that either most or all of the introductions above referred to were drawn with the sayings from Q by Lk, while Mt dropped them out; and also that the exclamations or questions which interrupt discourses in Lk 11:45; 12:41; 17:37a (and possibly in 19:25) were retained from Q by Lk, and not added by him.

This statement of the case forms part of Sir John's discussion of the question of the "form" of S. It is offset under (iii) by instances tending to show (against Weiss) "that a very large proportion of sayings stood without them" in S.

I gratefully accept the endorsement by Professor Vernon Bartlet (*OS*, XI, p. 361) of my protest against the circuitous reasoning which assumes on the basis of Mt and traditions attaching to it that S was a mere *Spruchsammlung* or "loose aggregation of disconnected logia." In B. Weiss' *QL* will be found the most systematic argument for S^p and S^{mk}, that is, such narrative material in S as has filtered down through Mk and L and thus escapes recognition by the school of critics who are guided in their view of S by the method favored by Mt rather than the Lukan.

Our assumption is that S was a *Redesammlung* rather than a mere *Spruchsammlung*, thus lending itself to development along either line, whether biographic (in Hawkins' terminology "chronological"), or gnomic (Hawkins' "homiletic"). Mt's combination of S with Mk aggregates the "doings" (πραχθέντα) into masses of condensed narrative introductory to the five similarly massed bodies of "sayings" (λεχθέντα), the resultant work terminating with an Epilogue indispensable to this form of composition. The Epilogue is naturally based on Mk. By this method, kindred to that employed in the talmudic treatise of the Sayings of the Fathers (*Pirke Aboth*),

narrative has relatively little place for its own sake. Papias' language suggests the designation "syntactic," but we have preferred to call Mt's the "gnomic" method.

Lk has more sense of the value of history. His predecessor L (if we may forestall demonstration) had already shown similar appreciation by copious expansion of the biographic content of S, whether with or without influence from Mk. Lk's term for a gospel writing of this kind, including his own work, is a "narrative" (διήγησις). Obviously its tendency will be the opposite from Mt's in the use of S. We may expect in Lk (and even more in L) expansion on the side of narrative and "story" parable. Every element S could furnish of the "doings" will be exploited in this interest, reversing completely the tendency of Mt toward the gnomic method and ideal, of the rabbis.

Endorsement of Sir John's criticism of Wernle's and Loisy's extreme *Spruchsammlung* theory, a criticism which surely proves that "Lk does not invent the surroundings of the discourses that he repeats," would be superfluous, our judgment being already on record from long before.[3] Two instances should suffice to prove real and intentional *omission* on the part of Mt. The first is Lk's introduction to the Q discourse on Abiding Wealth (Lk 12:13–21), omitted by Mt when taking up the discourse into his expanded form of the discourse on Filial Righteousness in 6:19–21, 24–34. In my *SM* (pp. 69 ff.) it was shown that the parable of the Rich Fool (Solomon of Eccl. 2:4–11), who depends on "store-chambers and barns" for his wealth, cannot be detached from the sequel describing the fowls of the air, who have "neither store-chambers nor barns," and the lilies of the field, whose glory surpasses the robes of "Solomon." Lk 12:13–21 must therefore be classed as S^p.

In his *QL* (p. 73) B. Weiss gives a second instance. Mt's same Sermon embodies Jesus' teaching on Prayer (Mt 6:7–13; 7:7–11), omitting both the preliminary narrative setting (Lk 11:1) and the parable of the Importunate Friend (11:5–8) which follows. But in the Q teaching as incorporated by both witnesses (Mt 7:7–11 = Lk 11:9–13) the phrase appears "Knock, and it shall be opened unto you." The phrase is used with apparent reference to the knocking of the importunate friend in the omitted parable. Lk 11:1, 5–8 again must be classed as S^p.

It need not follow that the occasions omitted by Mt were in point of historical fact the actual occasions on which the discourses were delivered. But it does clearly appear that Lk was not the first to arrange the teaching material in biographic order—a fact implied by his preface—and that Mt's tendency to abbreviate Markan

[3] *SM*, 1901, pp. 68 ff.

narrative extended to the "story-parable" as well. Mt was, indeed, compelled to strip the discourses on Abiding Wealth and on Prayer of their narrative occasion to fit them into his Discourse on Righteousness. But another location could have been found for the two parables had he valued them. Inferences, therefore as to the gnomic form of S based upon the non-appearance of Story parables in Mt are invalid. The attempted distinction between the "short parable" as distinctive of Mt and the "story parable" as distinctive of Lk has no value beyond establishing what we already knew, viz., that the gnomic type of compilation abbreviates narrative, and that "story-parable" belongs, for our evangelists, under the head of "narrative." Mt (and Mt's possible predecessors) can extend and supplement freely for purposes of allegorical application when they consider that occasion requires, that is, when the lesson in view calls for special emphasis. Lk (and Lk's unknown predecessors) can also extend and supplement freely in support of the lesson as *they* understand it. There is no reliable determining who is responsible for the longer or shorter form of a given Q parable, whether Mt or Lk or S, without knowledge of the particular bent and interest of each. In Lk (and L also, if an L be admitted) the tendency was toward *narrative* expansion, on how good authority only internal evidence can show. As we shall see, it is fortunately possible to determine in some degree at least the particular bent and interest of R^{mt}.

We have then, good reason to believe that the non-appearance of such story-parables as the Importunate Friend and Importunate Widow in Mt's form of the Discourse on Prayer is not due to their absence from S. In like manner, for all their non-appearance in Mt, the parables of the Cheating Steward and the Rich Man and Lazarus may perfectly well have been attached to the S discourse on Treasure in Heaven, a discourse which appears to have been prefaced in S by the omitted parable of the Rich Fool (Lk 12:13–21; 16:1–9, 19–25). Nevertheless we can *not* infer that Mt would omit from his setting of the Discourse on the Baptist such an anecdote as the Raising of the Widow's Son at Nain (Lk 7:11–17), because Mt has occasion for material of this kind in ch. 9. The difference is patent. The anecdote of the Widow's Son justifies the statement "the dead are raised up" in Jesus' reference to the present fulfilment of the prophecies of the Consolation of Israel, a statement, which Lk (or L) wrongly takes in the literal sense. The anecdote of the Penitent Harlot has a similar purpose, attached after the discourse by Lk in 7:36–50, for it admirably illustrates the clause "eateth with . . . sinners." It is possible to suppose that Mt deliberately discarded this most beautiful and touching of all the ancedotes of Jesus' message of forgiveness, because we know that in Eusebius' time not

one of our canonical evangelists had admitted its companion story, the Woman taken in Adultery, preserved only in Papias and the *Ev. Hebr.* in Eusebius' time, and because Mt in addition discarded another anecdote of woman's piety of similar pathos contained (at least according to all surviving texts) in Mk 12:41–44. But it is very difficult to suppose that Mt purposely left out the Raising of the Widow's Son. It is indeed supposable that Mt understood better than Lk the symbolic sense of the prophecy of the raising to life of Jehovah's dead people, used in Jesus' message to John, and so might disregard Lk's *connection* for the anecdote. But he would hardly resort to the kind of duplication displayed in 9:27–34 had he not been hard put to it to fill up the number *ten* for his list of Mighty Works forming II, A. For while the "commandments" are Mt's chief interest he is also concerned at this point for what he regards as their proper setting. Thus in his narrative introduction to the Mission of the Twelve Mt is indeed abbreviating, as usual in his transcription of Markan narrative; but he is also scraping together instances of every kind of "mighty work," both from Mk and S, in an order adapted to his own purposes. For Mt himself is also a compiler of "doings" as well as "sayings," and in the present case he aims to make up a parallel to Old Testament prodigies related of Moses in Egypt and the Wilderness. Mk's miracles of healing did not suffice for Mt's purpose unless he included the Exorcism of a Dumb Devil (Mk 7:31–37) and the Opening of Blind Eyes (Mk 8:22–26). Both of these he includes; but not in the extended thaumaturgic form given them by Mk. No; Mt presents them in the briefer Q form in spite of later duplication.[4] It is difficult to imagine that if he knew the story of the Raising of the Widow's Son in S he would not have used it somewhere in the list in preference to his complicated method of completing his decad. The raising to life of the widow's son at Nain must therefore be classed with the *involuntary* omissions of Mt, in other words it was unknown to him.

Conversely it is easy to see why this anecdote, if not that of the Penitent Harlot as well, should have been *added* in the Lukan version of S. The fact that it was originally related in some other context than that of S is made probable by the literal sense in which its compiler takes the phrase "the dead are raised up." It has been gathered up from oral tradition not by Lk but by some predecessor (L). The reader will ask, Why not hold Lk himself responsible? We answer: Because in the case of the other illustrative anecdote, the Penitent Harlot, Lk has cancelled the similar Markan story of the Anointing in Bethany (Mk 14:3–9), obviously to avoid duplication. Now critics recognize as interpolations certain incongruous embel-

[4] Mt 9:27–31 (*cf.* 20:29–34) and 32–34 (*cf.* 12:22 f.).

lishments to the Penitent Harlot drawn from Mk 14:3 ff. and inserted in Lk 7:37 f., 40, 43, 46; and if these are removed it becomes immediately apparent that the two stories are *not* duplicates. The occasions are not the same. The Penitent Harlot bedews the feet of the Messenger of divine forgiveness with her tears of love and gratitude, then hastily with her braided hair wipes away what she accounts defilement. The woman disciple at Bethany seeks openly to proclaim her faith in the Son of David, anointing him (in her intention) for the throne she expects him to occupy; though in reality it is—as Jesus says—for the tomb. The name "Simon" for the host and the vial of precious ointment are wholly out of place in the story of the Penitent Harlot, as is shown by their belated point of attachment. These touches are contaminations of the original, and are due to the influence of Mk 14:3 ff. But had Lk himself been responsible for them he would not have drawn the false inference of duplication which led him to cancel Mk's story of the Anointing in Bethany. We infer that the exquisite story of the Penitent Harlot, with its interwoven "story-parable" is not the work of Lk but of a different and earlier hand (L). We also infer that the probable reason why at least the Raising of the Widow's Son, a part of the same connection, does not appear in Mt is not lack of willingness on Mt's part to include it, but lack of knowledge, inasmuch as his form of S did not contain the story.

All this goes to corroborate the view of the many critics both before and after Streeter who have held to the doctrine of a "precanonical tradition of Lk." It also confirms the idea that this biographic development of the teaching material was later than Mk and to some extent influenced by it. The new feature of this long popular theory of a Lukan "Special Source" which marks the distinctive contribution of Streeter is that this unknown L was no other than Lk himself, as yet unacquainted with the work of Mk. To this feature we cannot subscribe, partly for the reason just given in the case of the cancellation of Mk 14:3 ff., partly for other reasons discussed in *GM*, pp. 193 ff. That which seems clearest is that in the case of Lk, if not of Mt also, we must leave room for predecessors in the line of transmission, some developing S in the direction of added anecdote (biographic expansion) others in that of "commandment" (gnomic expansion). Of course it is only the latest stages of this two-fold process which are in any measure within our control. However, it is at least possible to make a beginning with Mt. We have seen enough of his redactional method in the case of Mk to realize that the limits of his activity, whether in supplementation, recasting, rearrangement, or omission, are wider than is commonly assumed. Especially must it be fully apparent that no merely mechanical ap-

plication of the rule of verbal identity can determine the extent of Q. Elements of the "single-tradition" of Mt (P^{mt}) may be derived from S in spite of their non-appearance in Lk or their great differences of form or order. Conversely elements of S may appear in P^{lk} in spite of their non-appearance elsewhere, or their appearance in widely different form and order.

Three considerations, meantime, make it more probable that the non-appearance of the Lukan story-parables in Mt is not wholly due to Mt's disposition to omit narrative in favor of "commandment." (1) While a certain number, such as the Cheating Steward (Lk 16:1–9), the Importunate Friend (Lk 11:5–8), and Importunate Widow (Lk 18:1–8), might have seemed to Mt objectionable, and while we have evidence to show that the non-appearance of the Rich Fool (12:16–21) and the Importunate Friend is actually due to intentional omission, the entire mass of the Lukan story parables is too great to be thus accounted for. The Good Samaritan might conflict with certain Matthean prejudices (Lk 10:30–35; *cf.* Mt 10:5), but hardly that of the Pharisee and Publican (Lk 18:9–14), or that of the Rich Man and Lazarus (Lk 16:19–25). There is also a peculiar tone of pathos which characterizes the Lukan group of antithetic types in such parables as the Pharisee and Publican, the Samaritan and the Priests (Good Samaritan), the Two Forgiven Debtors (7:41–43), the Elder and Younger Brother (Prodigal Son), as well as anecdotes of contrast such as Mary and Martha (10:38–42), the Thankful Samaritan Leper (17:11–19), the Penitent Thief (23:39–43), Zacchaeus (19:1–10), and the Penitent Harlot (7:36–50). This antithetic method is probably due chiefly to the compiler of the group (L), whose work was unknown to Mt.[5]

(2) The parable of the Elder and Younger Brother (Prodigal Son) appears in Mt 21:28–32 in a form so widely different as to lead most critics to deny identity. If these two forms are actually derived from one original they are at least mutually independent. The Lukan forms part of the L group. The Matthean might be from S. A certain amount of overlapping between L and S is noticeable elsewhere.

(3) Within the limits of his two non-Mk blocks of material we should expect Lk to preserve the original order. As shown in my articles in *JBL* for 1915, 1917, and 1918 (XXXIV, pp. 166–179; XXXVI, pp. 112–139; XXXVII, pp. 20–53) this is far from being

[5] The anecdote of the Widow's Mites belongs clearly to this type, as well as the Woman Taken in Adultery. If Mt's omission of the Widow's Mites is indeed intentional this might argue for like treatment of the entire group. The loose relation of this section (Mk 12:41–44=Lk 21:1–4) to the context suggests the possibility that in Mt's text of Mk this anecdote did not appear. The Woman Taken in Adultery appeared in Eusebius' time only in uncanonical tradition.

the case. Lk has rearranged the material according to his own ideas of sequence, adapting *ad vocem* connections to a geographical and chronological scheme. This can be more easily accounted for if he (or his predecessor L) was blending two sources.

For the above three reasons it appears more probable that Mt's omissions are due in many cases to lack of knowledge of the Lukan source L. In some cases we have seen reason to hold his omissions to be deliberate. These tend to show that L reproduces better than Mt the characteristics of S.

On the other hand if Lk has access to two forms of S, the one form that shared with Mt, the other (L) an expanded form, perhaps influenced by Mk, and containing such discourse supplements as the Baptist's definition of the Fruits meet for Repentance (Lk 3:10–14) and the Woes after the Beatitudes (6:24–26), such parabolic material as the "story" parables of chh. 15–17, and such anecdotes as Mary and Martha (10:38–42), the Healing of the Crooked Woman (13:10–17), the Penitent Harlot (7:36–50) and Penitent Thief (23:39–43), Zacchaeus (19:1–10), and the Grateful and Thankless Lepers (17:11–19), this L document, whose S material Lk could at any time substitute for that of the form known to Mt, goes far to remove any occasion for positing an additional M document accessible only to Mt. Whether grounds really exist for Streeter's recent resort to such a hypothetical M document is a question for our next chapter on the P material of Mt. More detailed consideration will be given to it in Appended Note VIII.

Reconstruction of the lost sources S and L does not come within the scope of the present volume, even in the narrowly restricted sense in which alone the term "reconstruction" is applicable. Nevertheless under the topic Matthean Omissions there is occasion for consideration of two questions connected with these. (1) Why have we no trace of acquaintance with L in either the Preamble or the Epilogue of Mt? (2) Why have we so little trace of material from S in Mt's Passion story? At the risk of seeming to use unnecessary repetition a summary of conclusions on these two points will be desirable before proceeding to the analysis of P^{mt}.

1. In the gap so conspicuous in Mt 3:1 between the Preamble and the Narrative Introduction to Book I the reader naturally expects something corresponding to Lk's story of the boyhood of Jesus, especially if so winsome a story as that of the youthful Questioner in the Temple (Lk 2:41–51) was accessible to Mt as part of the L source.

Correspondingly in the Epilogue it is astonishing to find no trace of any of the appearances of the risen Christ in and near Jerusalem,

appearances to which the attention of Lk is exclusively confined. The partial exception formed by Mt 28:9 f. belongs to the type of those which "prove the rule" because of its superfluity in the context, since the appearance of Jesus adds nothing to the message already entrusted to the women by the angel, which they are already hastening to deliver.

The answer to this apparent neglect of Mt is already before us in substance. The infancy chapters of Lk and the Resurrection appearances fill out an almost intolerable gap in Mk by the use of material which, whether from L or some other source, is *unknown* to Mt. Our first evangelist meets the same defect of Mk in a manner so completely independent of Lk that the utmost that can be said as to any interrelation is the suggestion of von Dobschütz [6] that indirectly, through purely oral channels, some remote inkling of the Lk solution had come to the ears of Mt. Such a suggestion would be applicable to Mt's construction (from the LXX supplemented in verses 13–15 from unknown sources) of a genealogy inconsistent with Lk's, his variant story of the Virgin Birth (1:18–25), and his story of Jesus' Appearance to the Women (28:9 f.).

On the other hand the use in Mt 18:10–14=Lk 15:3–7 of only one of the symmetrical pair of parables of the Lost Coin (Lk 15:8–10) and Lost Sheep suggests the same process of deliberate omission exemplified in the omission of the third example of Renunciation in Mk 9:43–48 (reproduced both in Mt 5:29 f. and 18:8 f. *without* Mk 9:45), and again exemplified in the omission of the parables introductory to the Q discourses on Prayer (Mt 6:9–13=Lk 11:1–4) and on Abiding Wealth (Mt 6:19 ff.=Lk 12:22 ff.). However, it is at least as probable an explanation of the non-appearance in Mt of the parable of the Lost Coin that the accompanying parable of the Lost Sheep was the only one of the pair which appeared in S, its companion owing its presence in Lk to the fact that in ch. 15 Lk is following L; for the verbal similarity of Mt 18:12 f. to Lk 15:4–7 is not close. The apparent omission by Mt would thus be in reality an addition by L, just as the S form of the Elder and Younger Son (Mt 21:28–32) appears in Lk 15 (L?) at much greater length and in three-fold literary symmetry with the Lost Coin and Lost Sheep.

2. In the case of the non-appearance of S material in the Passion story of Mt the solution of the problem is less simple. Considering the method habitual with Mt of interweaving Q material with Mk it is natural to expect that even in the Passion story, where Mk would naturally predominate, there would be further trace of S than actually appears. The majority of critics, accordingly, take the view that S was "not a gospel," as containing no reference to Jesus' death and

[6] *ZNW*, XXVII, 3/4 (1928).

resurrection. *Per contra* the present writer, with Weiss, Burkitt, and Vernon Bartlet, has maintained that a composition which began with the narrative of the Baptist's Preaching, the Baptism, Vocation, and Temptation of Jesus, could not end without some corresponding account of how this Vocation was fulfilled. To leave Jesus on the stage still discoursing would be an anti-climax inconceivable in a work of the literary quality of S, using Q alone as our basis of judgment.

In justification of this broader view of the content of S it is pointed out by Burkitt and others that the Q material itself is *not* limited to the Galilean ministry of teaching. Wernle's omission of Jesus' promise of Twelve Thrones in the New Jerusalem to those who had "been with him in his trials" (Mt 19:28=Lk 22:28–30) from the list of Q passages (*SF*, p. 224) has not commended itself even to Harnack (*Btr*, II, pp. 95 and 146, Engl.); the logion must therefore be included as part of S regardless of consequences to the theory that S contained no Passion story. To Burkitt this alone is enough to disprove the limitation.

As between Mt's and Lk's version of the promise, context and wording alike are more authentically given by Lk. The logion here forms part of a highly distinctive, non-Pauline account of the Institution of the Covenant Repast,[7] doubtless drawn by Lk from L, who doubtless drew from S. Mt has taken the logion out of its context, as he so frequently does, has rewritten it in his own characteristic phraseology,[8] and inserted it into a Markan passage. Now as Burkitt points out (p. 141), the continuation in Lk 22:31–38 is a section wholly appropriate to the occasion, necessarily from high historical authority, and completely congruous and *pari materia* with Q. But this would not exclude L as a possible source. We must also observe with B. Weiss (*QL*, p. 90) that the remainder of verse 35, "When I sent you forth," etc., is a direct reference to the mission recorded in Q (Mt 10:9 f.=Lk 10:4). It becomes, therefore, highly improbable that the coincidence between Mt and Lk in this Promise to the Twelve is due to common dependence on a *second* non-Markan source. It also assures us that S itself furnished part of the Lukan Passion story. Where we should draw the line between the P^{lk} material derived from S and other parts of Lk's non-Markan Passion story only interconnection by cross-reference or otherwise can decide. In other words our standard of measurement must leave room for a certain amount of direct interconnection, as when Lk 22:35 makes explicit reference to Lk 10:4.

[7] "I *covenant* to you, even as my Father *covenanted* to me a kingdom."

[8] Note οἱ ἀκολουθήσαντές μοι for διαμεμενηκότες μετ' ἐμοῦ κτλ., παλιγγενεσία, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ.

Nor can historical probability decide. The assumption that S would not have placed the story of the Quarrel for Precedence in the midst of the tragic scenes of the night of betrayal unless such had been its true place, is unfortunately not a safe guide to the original order. The actual sequence of Lk (who seldom alters that of his sources) is more likely to represent S. It is perfectly possible that Mk may be historically correct in placing the Quarrel for Precedence on the road to Jerusalem, and that S, notwithstanding its greater antiquity, gave an unhistorical occasion for the story, locating it chiefly with reference to its moral lesson.

A small but not insignificant exception to the rule of the disappearance of Q material from the scenes in Jerusalem must be added in the reference to Q of Mt 21:10 f., 14–16=Lk 19:37–40, which V. Taylor justly defends.[9]

In our analysis of P^{mt} in Chapter IX we shall see reason to include also the parable of the Dissatisfied Wage-earners (Mt 20:1–15) among the S elements of Mt. If the argument be conceded a third factor will be added to plead against the view that S was "not a gospel" and "contained no account of the Passion"; for the association of this parable with the Vineyard parables of Mk 12:1–11, Mt 21:28–32 and the Grace vs. Law group of Mk 10:17–45 bespeaks connection with utterances of the last period.

Nevertheless the rarity of Q material in the Passion story of Mt undoubtedly leaves room to invoke the principle above appealed to that exceptions of a certain character only "prove the rule." It is difficult to believe that Mt limited himself to Mk in his closing narrative by intentional exclusion of a real Passion story which he could have exploited in S. If the Passion and Resurrection appeared in S it will have been in some other form; doubtless a form analogous to the relation of narrative to discourse in the Q material generally; that is, in the description applied by Hawkins to the omitted Lk sections, Lk 11:1, 27 f., 37 f.; 12:13, "narratives introduced for the purpose of leading up to important logia."

The Q passage Mt 12:22=Lk 11:14 (Exorcism of the Dumb Devil) thus "leads up to" the great anti-Pharisaic discourse at the close of the Galilean ministry. The Q stories of John's Baptism, the Vocation and Temptation of Jesus similarly "lead up to" the story of the public ministry as a whole. Doubtless the story of the Centurion's Servant (Mt 8:5–10=Lk 7:2–9), a Q narrative which differs in no definable respect from Mk's anecdotes told with similar purpose, "led up to" some "important logion" of the type of that to which Mt has joined it (Mt 8:11 f.=Lk 13:28–30).

Let it be supposed, then, that the "important logion" of the

[9] *Behind the Third Gospel*, p. 94 f.

Thrones of the House of David (for Mt 19:28=Lk 22:28–30 was recognized no later than by Andreas of Caesarea as an echo of Ps. 122:5) was "led up to" in S by some such account of the Covenant Supper as actually prefaces it in Lk 22:24–30a, though this context may perhaps represent an L development rather than S in its original form. Can it be imagined that Mt, whose reverence for the authority of Peter must be judged by such incorporated passages as Mt 16:16–19 and its companion "Petrine supplements," would give preference to an unauthoritative preliminary narrative of S, when Mk's "Reminiscences of Peter" gave a much more circumstantial and (biographically speaking) correct account of the Dispute as to Who shall be Greatest (Mk 10:28–31)? Would he be apt to use a non-Petrine story of the Covenant Supper in preference to Mk 14:22–25? We may be thankful rather that his disposition to interweave even small bits of S in his Mk material has preserved the shreds of Q in 19:28 and 21:10 f., 14–16.

But if Mt, impelled by an excessive respect for the Petrine authority of Mk, or for any other reason, has set aside the preliminary narrative of S in favor of the far more detailed account of Mk, all we can do is to fall back on Lk, who at least has a non-Markan story (L) whereof the nuclear logion coincides with Mt 19:28. On this we must frame our idea of what really formed the closing scenes of S. The "reconstruction" will inevitably follow the outline of Lk's Passion story minus the Mk material.

The farewell Supper on the night of betrayal will then be the narrative framework for two important elements of discourse: (a) The Promise of Reunion in the glory of the New Jerusalem, substantially an equivalent for the "faithful saying" quoted in II Tim 2:11–13; (b) a *second* Mission of the Twelve, contrasted explicitly with the first related in the Q passage Mt 10:9 f.=Lk 10:4, and including a substantial equivalent for the warning of the world's hatred and promise of the Advocate in Jn 16:1–8.

Now Mt has made of the two sendings a single final Mission of the Twelve in the Discourse of Book II. He has included in it the promise of the Advocate (Mt 10:19 f.=Lk 12:11 f.), here entirely misplaced, together with other material borrowed from Mk 13:9–13. For Mk is of course responsible for the displacement in both Mt and Lk. But the indispensable narrative context of *two* farewell discourses of Jesus may be restored, as B. Weiss has seen.[10]

Let us assume, then, that a present-day biographer were set the task of embodying in the form of discourse the pragmatic content of the Passion story, which Mk relates in narrative form. He would surely make its two themes exactly those of our two Q fragments:

[10] *QL*, pp. 90, 122–131.

(a) "the sufferings of Jesus and the glories that should follow" (I Pt. 1:11), (b) the Apostolic Commission and Promise of the Spirit. These two elements of the Passion story it was perfectly possible to set forth in the form of discourse, using little more of actual narrative than enough to show how Jesus' prediction and promise were fulfilled.

If the closing division of S included such elements as the parable of the Elder and Younger Son, led up to as in Mt 21:28–32 by the narrative of the Purging of the Temple; if it included in addition the Promise of Thrones in the New Jerusalem (Mt 19:28=Lk 22:28–30) led up to by the narrative of the Quarrel as to Who shall be Greatest and the Farewell Supper, as in Mt 19:27, and Lk 22:24–30; if, finally, it also included the ultimate Mission of the Twelve, with Prediction of the World's Hostility offset by the Promise of the Spirit, as in Mt 10:16–20=Lk 10:3; 12:11 f., there will be little ground for reproaches against Mt for neglect to make use of it. Mt's changes were principally changes of form tending toward the gnomic as L and Lk favor the biographic.

No doubt the advent of Mk made a vast difference to the writers of Gospels. Its ending in particular, whose original form can only be guessed at from Petrine tradition surviving elsewhere compared with Mk's own anticipations in 14:27 f., led to the kind of division we see illustrated in the work of Lk, in which the major emphasis of the resurrection doctrine appears in a second "treatise." The division of the record into two sections, Gospel and Acts, no doubt played a part in the disappearance of the original ending of Mk.[11] But the values of the resurrection doctrine had already been given in S, if we may include in it that which we have just seen to be its probable content. Mk as we have it in our critical texts had set the standard for "gospel" writing when Lk and Mt were compiled. The consequence was that such expression as S had given to the religious values of the Passion story by its form of discourses "led up to" by a bare outline of introductory narrative gave way. Mt incorporates the second Mission of the Twelve into the Discourse of his Book II, composing only a perfunctory substitute in 28:16–20 to piece out the truncated Mk. Other portions of the closing discourses of S, whose original place still appears in L and Jn, found lodgment in the general framework of Markan narrative. In Lk they appear only in the recast of L.

We are therefore under no compulsion to accept the theory that S was "not a gospel." We know that it began as a drama of the Message of Salvation, the divine Messenger being introduced to the spectator as "the Son of God" in a voice from heaven, while a fore-

[11] See my *GM*, Ch. XV.

cast of his redemptive career was conveyed in the symbolic story of the Temptation. It cannot, then, have ended with the Messenger still upon the stage, still reciting his unfinished lines. The literary quality of the Q material in such S discourses as that comparing the work of Jesus and John (Mt 11:2–19=Lk 7:18–35) forbids such an estimate of its unknown author's capacity. We need not, then, suppose that S left out the most essential part of the gospel message. We may assume that its writer did include the Passion story "in some form," [12] presumably the form of discourse "led up to" by a minimum of narrative.

[12] *OS*, p. 335.

CHAPTER IX

MT'S SINGLE-TRADITION (P) MATERIAL

Successive subtraction of the Mk and Q material from Mt leaves a comparatively small amount to be accounted for. This P^{mt} material may be classified in four divisions: (1) S^{p}, that is material derived from S but as yet unidentified; (2) material derived from other written sources such as L, or a possible M or N; (3) material derived from oral tradition (O); (4) material supplied by the evangelist himself without extraneous contribution (R).

As respects value for an authentic record of the life and teaching of Jesus these P elements will rank nearly in the order named. S material needs no appraisal. Written sources such as the L supposed by many critics to underlie Lk, or the M which Streeter finds in Mt similarly mediating between the canonical Gospel and S, would have high claims if the existence of the document were made probable. N is widely recognized to be apocryphal. Oral tradition might conceivably still retain in Mt's day some authentic report of Jesus' life and teaching, though each section would invite separate judgment as to its authenticity and value. Lastly elements contributed by the evangelist himself in the mere adaptation of his material would have no contribution to make as regards the earlier time.

To the critic, contrariwise, the relative valuation of the P elements may be almost reversed. For source analysis, which is the critic's prior interest, the R factor is vital. It is essential to the reliability of his results that he use every means of acquiring a clear apprehension of the evangelist's purpose and qualifications. Without accurate discrimination between such purely redactional material as reflects R^{mt} personally, and such current material, oral or written, as he has embodied, it is impossible to do justice to the work as a whole. Reserving a special chapter for this study of "Traits of the Redactor" we may proceed to discuss the other factors of P^{mt} in the order of their historical value.

Additions to S from P based primarily on the individual critic's impression of affinity with Q are justly questioned by the contributors to *OS*. As an example of this defect of method we may take the judgment of Wernle on two parables added in P^{mt} to the Mk group on Hiding the Mystery of the Kingdom. These are the two short

parables of Hid Treasure and Costly Pearl (Mt 13:44–46) which Wernle (*SF*, p. 187) assigns to Q (*sc.* S) on the inadequate ground that "they are told in the same style as those of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven, with no alien addition." [1] It is true that the commonplaces of "treasure in heaven" and "pearls" as a measure of value are not unknown to the discourse of Jesus (Mk 10:21; Mt 6:20=Lk 12:33 and Mt 7:6); but the motive which distinguishes Jesus' exhortations to right living from those of Mt and the rabbis generally is here lacking. Jesus emphasizes inward values as against outward, Mt present vs. future. The "style," like the motive, can only be called "Matthean." Its distinctive feature is the stereotyped formula "The Kingdom of heaven is like unto" uniformly prefixed by Mt even when inappropriate. The position of the two appended parables, raising the total of Mk's group to seven, and the correspondence thus effected with all the rest of Mt's Discourses which uniformly conclude with depictions of reward and punishment in the world to come, also point to R as author. The dubious morality of the finder of the Hid Treasure does not affect the question.[2] Oral tradition (in which must be included Jewish Synagogue exhortation as well as possible reminiscence of real utterances of Jesus) is quite sufficient to account for such historic value as the two comparisons may possess. R^{mt}, who can elaborate 10:40–42 on the slender basis of Mk 9:37, 41 plus a rabbinic proverb, who can expand the nucleus Lk 12:35 f. into the parable of the Ten Virgins (Mt 25:1–13), or compose the splendid picture of the Judgment of 25:31–46 with only Mk 9:37 as a text, would need little help from tradition to re-enforce his favorite doctrine by two comparisons of the kingdom of heaven to Hid Treasure and a Costly Pearl.[3] Lk's omission of the two makes improbable their derivation from S.

A better claim can be made out for the three-fold example of Inwardness in Worship in Mt 6:1–8, 16–18, again supported by Wernle on grounds of style. A glance at our translation below [4] will show that this table of duties toward God appended by Mt to the Q section on duty toward man (5:43–48) forms an instructive example of his method of piece-work compilation. If proper note be now taken of the witness of Lk it will be apparent that we should

[1] Hawkins concurs nevertheless in this judgment (*OS*, III, p. 136).

[2] See McNeile *ad loc.*

[3] A rabbinic parallel to the Costly Pearl is given by Nork (*Rabbinische Quellen*, 1839, p. 73) from *Shabbath* fol. 119a. Astrologers predicted to a rich man that all his property would pass into the hands of a neighbor. He decided to sell all, investing the proceeds in one pearl. Taking a journey thereafter by sea he was shipwrecked and drowned, the pearl was swallowed by a fish, which when caught was sold to the neighbor.

[4] Part III. See also Appended Note VIII.

follow Marriott [5] in taking the Q material Mt 7:1 ff. = Lk 6:37 ff. as the immediate sequel to Mt 5:43–48. The long digression on Right Religion (6:1–18) and its Heavenly Reward (19–34) is compiled by R^{mt} from various sources. The Q material (6:9–13 and 19–34) can be traced, thanks to Lk, to its original connection. The opening verse (6:1) may be assigned to R^{mt} on linguistic grounds. The enclosing framework of the Lord's Prayer, verses 7–8 and 14–15, which Mt substitutes for the Lk context, is probably "due to the compiler" for reasons stated by Marriott. Other reasons will appear presently. As to the remainder, Mt 6: 2–6 and 6–18, "decision is not easy."

> The errors they condemn are especially Pharisaic, and the phraseology and allusions are Jewish (*e.g.*, δικαιοσύνη in verse 1, ὑποκριταί in verses 2, 5, 16, μὴ σαλπίσῃς ἐμπροσθέν σου in verse 2). It is thus the sort of matter which Lk might well omit.

Nevertheless, in view of six considerations of some weight Marriott is disinclined to admit the section as having formed part of S. The sixth of these indicates what disposal he would make of the material.

> The parallelism and homogeneity of the three divisions of Mt 6:1–6, 16–18 are remarkable. The illustrations of the contrast between the old moral standards and the new in the preceding passage do not exhibit anything equal to this balance and parallelism.[6] Perhaps it is on this ground more likely, as Dean Robinson thinks,[7] that these verses constitute a "little sermon" which at one time "had a separate existence of its own."

It seems improbable indeed that R^{mt} should have produced so fine an example of literary symmetry, only to destroy its beauty by the immediate interjection of material from other connections. Oral tradition would hardly account for the literary form of the "little sermon." On the other hand its contrast of inward vs. outward worship, as well as certain expressions such as μισθός in verses 1, 2, 5, 16 compared with 5:46, speak for its authenticity. Must we choose between S in some other connection and a third source such as the M posited by Streeter, containing (or consisting of) a parallel version of the Sermon; or does the theory of L provide a solution? Appended Note VIII must take up this question.

Another important passage claimed by Wernle as "perhaps" from S in spite of its non-appearance in Lk's parallel (Lk 10:21 f.) is Wisdom's Invitation, Mt 11:28–30. Allen (*ICC*, p. 123) notes the "undoubted dependence" of verses 28–30 on Ecclus. 50–51, transcribing the parallel phrases. Nevertheless he marks the entire passage

[5] *The Sermon on the Mount*, pp. 92 ff.
[6] This is hardly the case if deduction be made of R's interpolations.
[7] *Study of the Gospels*, p. 79.

25–29 as a unit belonging to the "Logia." Norden [8] also claims the whole for S, though equally at a loss with Wernle to account for Lk's omission. In this case decision is aided by the "undoubted dependence" on Ecclesiasticus, a writing more favored by the early rabbis than any other outside the strict canon of Akiba. Dependence almost equally clear on the same writing is observable in Mt's redactional framework of the Lord's Prayer:

Mt 6:7	Ecclus. 7:14
And in praying use not vain repetitions, as the Gentiles do; for they think they shall be heard for their much speaking.	Prate not in the multitude of the elders; and repeat not thy words in thy prayer.

Mt 6:14 f.	Ecclus. 28:1 f.
For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you. But if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses.	He that taketh vengeance shall find vengeance from the Lord, and He will surely make firm his sins. Forgive thy neighbor the hurt that he hath done thee, and then thy sins shall be pardoned when thou prayest.

In earlier discussions I have been disposed to take the explanation of B. Weiss [9] as sufficient to account for the non-appearance of Mt 11:28–30 in Lk's parallel. The balance of probability seems to be altered by the above. *Repeated* dependence on Ecclesiasticus suggests like derivation. Mt 6:7 f. and 14 f. being assignable to R the same is probably true of 11:28–30 also.

For systematic study of the question how far we may go in ascribing to S P^{mt} or P^{lk} material recourse should be had to the article of Sir John Hawkins entitled "Probabilities as to the so-called Double Tradition of St Mt and St Lk." [10] Beginning with a characterization of the source as to its nature and contents Sir John gives reasons why we should expect to find S material in the two "single traditions" (P), taking the following example (p. 132):

> The conjecture which is furthest from a mere guess and nearest to an inference is that Mt. 5:17–48, the long passage in which the contrast between the Jewish and the Christian law and standard of life is drawn out and illustrated by six examples, was for the most part drawn from Q (*sc.* S). For we have two intimations that at least the general framework of that passage was familiar to Lk—possibly of course in some other source known to him and Mt, but far more probably in the Q (*sc.* S) which they so often used in common.

[8] *Agnostos Theos*, p. 301. [9] *QL*, p. 70. [10] *OS*, III, pp. 95–138.

The two grounds are found in Lk 7:27 compared with Mt 5:43 f. and Lk 16:17 f. compared with Mt 5:30–32. It is unnecessary to express agreement with this reasoning since an earlier volume of my own (*SM*, 1902, p. 74 f.) has already made this clear. On the grounds stated Sir John regards Mt 5:17–48 as "a section which we may regard as more likely to have formed part of Q (*sc.* S) than any other which is found only in a single Gospel."

Next to this in the claim to rank as S^p "but at a considerable distance behind it" Hawkins would place a group of passages for whose omission by Lk we can more or less satisfactorily account. To this group would belong (a) "anti-Pharisaic discourses" such as "the more polemical parts of Mt 5:17–48 just referred to" and in addition Mt 6:1–8, 16–18; 15:12 f.; 21:28–32; 23:2, 3, 5, 14–22, 32 f. (b) Lk may also have omitted "as either obscure or uninteresting or even distasteful to his readers the sayings which we read in Mt 7:6; 10:5 f., 23; 12:5 f., 36 f.; 18:10, 17; 19:10–12."

Under group (a) of the above we can admit some cogency for Hawkins' explanation of the non-appearance in Lk of Inwardness in Worship (Mt 6:1–8, 16–18), a passage as to whose possible derivation from S judgment has been reserved; also for the Parable of the Elder and Younger Son (21:28–32), which might be the S equivalent of Lk 15:11–32 (L), omitted by Lk to avoid duplication. The remainder, belonging to the typical Matthean polemic against the leaders of the Synagogue, seems to our view to offer no claim whatever to derivation from S, nor indeed any reason why it should have been omitted by Lk. For Lk admits freely anti-Pharisaic material from S (*e.g.*, Lk 11:37–52).[11] What he omits is material of this kind which might seem *opposed to the authority of the Old Testament.* Mt's fierce polemic is that of rabbi against rabbi, the true "scribe who hath been made a disciple to the kingdom of heaven," against the blind guides who lead Israel to destruction through false interpretation of the Law and the Prophets. Against the latter class Mt launches such proverbial sayings as 15:12 f.; 12:36 f., and compiles such anathemas as 23:2, 3, 5, 14–22. Their affinity is rather with N than with S, so far as any source is sought beyond R and O.

In group (b) the sayings Mt 7:6; 10:5 f. and 23 might have been omitted by Lk as distasteful to his readers; 12:5 f. and 36 f. are far more likely to be supplements from our "rabbi made a disciple of the kingdom of heaven," 18:17 bears on its face the stamp of the church administrative rule of late date. There remains the possibility of derivation from S in the case of the Warning against Stumbling the Weak (18:10) and the Commendation of Celibacy (19:10–12), though it is not altogether apparent why Lk should purposely omit

[11] See, however, Acts 23:6; 26:5 f.

these. Against Mt 7:6; 10:5 f. and 23 we might place a doubtful N. The gleaning of possible S material from these two classes of P^{mt} is small indeed.

As a supporter of the view that S consisted of a loose agglomeration of disconnected logia (*Spruchsammlung* theory) Sir John naturally deprecates the disposition of critics such as B. Weiss to assign to it passages found in Mt or Lk but not in both of them, as to which we can only say that the subject-matter of them is either more or less congruous and *in pari materia* with what we have seen to be the contents of the "passages common to both Gospels" (*OS*, p. 135). Nevertheless he finds it impossible to exclude entirely this secondary criterion and therefore lists from (a) to (k) certain classes of passages which to his conception display this "congruity." Under (a) he would include "moral and religious teachings for Christians" such as 6:34; 11:28–30; 12:36 f.; 18:10, 19 f., on all but two of which judgment has already been expressed.[12] The exceptions are the Semitic equivalent for our own proverb "Do not borrow trouble," appended in 6:34, and the promise of answer to united prayer, 18:19 f. Proverbial sayings such as the former are common in Mt (*cf.* 5:14b; 7:6; 10:41; 12:37, etc.) Connection of the latter with *Pirqe Aboth*, III, 3 and *Oxyrhynchus Logia*, fragm. IV, suggests derivation from O along with the preceding context. No definable reason can be given why Lk should omit these logia if he found them in S.

Under the heads of (b) "warnings to opposing Jews," (c) "anti-Pharisaic denunciations," (d) "sayings specially addressed to teachers," (e) "references to the Parousia," Hawkins brings forward a list of passages which one would imagine specially chosen as characteristic not of S but of R. A "warning to opposing Jews" more distinctively "Matthean" than 21:43 would be hard to conceive. The "anti-Pharisaic denunciation" Mt 15:12 f. has already been characterized.[13] It shares the character of "Matthean" and rabbinic with the "sayings addressed to teachers" Mt 23:7b–10. The "reference to the Parousia" (really a charge of the calamities of the last times to the account of the "false prophets" and workers of ἀνομία) in Mt 24:11 f. is unmistakably the product of R's own pen. Passages (b) to (e) we should classify not as S^{p} but as R^{mt}.

The only other P^{mt} elements in which Hawkins finds "congruity" with S are certain parables, classified under (g), the six "quotations" from the Mosaic law brought forward for comment in Mt 5:17–48, which differ in character from the "direct quotations" he regards as rare in S, classified under (h), single miracles "introduced for the purpose of leading up to important logia of Jesus," classified under (i), and finally, under (k), possible P^{mt} material in the Passion narratives.

[12] See above, pp. 122 f., 124.

[13] Above, p. 124.

The Scripture quotations of Mt form a subject by themselves. To those assignable to S we have felt it necessary to devote an Appended Note.[14] Single miracles of the type described under (i) do not occur in P^{mt}. As regards (k) apart from the single Q passage promising the "thrones of the house of David" to the Twelve in the messianic kingdom (Mt 19:28 = Lk 22:28–30) we have seen that Mt bases his Passion *narrative* (as distinguished from discourse) on Mk, save for a few apocryphal supplements certainly not from S. The nature and derivation of these supplements must be discussed in our Special Introduction to the Epilogue.

If, then, Passion narratives have survived from S we must look for them in P^{lk}. This leaves of classes (f) to (k) only the Matthean parables (g). These require treatment at considerable length, because of certain notable characteristics which differentiate them as a group from the Lukan, whether because of an additional source available to none but Lk, rich in parables of the "story" type; or because of predilections of Mt which led him to omit S material of this character which Lk retained.

Sir John considers "the fewness (or possibly absence) of long parables" to be characteristic of Q (*sc.* S). We must record dissent at the outset from any such standard of judgment. The controlling motive is not, with any of our evangelists, either aesthetic or historical. It is primarily religious. Mt in particular cares little whether a parable be long or short, interrogative or narrative in form, if only it fulfil the function he requires of every parable he takes up, viz., to illustrate the particular religious lesson he seeks to inculcate. He includes and omits parables regardless of these distinctions. He elaborates parables at great length, as in his construction of the Tares from Mk's Patient Husbandman or the Ten Virgins from the S^q admonition to Watchfulness and warning of the Fast-closing Door. He attaches supplementary brief parables when occasion requires, as in 13:44–46. He does not hesitate to attach a very long parable in narrative form to the Q saying on Forgiving a Brother (Mt 18:15, 21 f. = Lk 17:3 f.) in 18:23–35, when concerned to close his Discourse on Church Relations with an appropriate presentation of his favorite maxim,[15] nor does he scruple to cancel parables both long and short when incorporating the material they introduce in one of his agglutinated Discourses.[16] In a word Mt acts in full appreciation of the distinction already laid down, that for our evangelists parable is "illustrative fiction" and for that reason enjoys no such

[14] See Appended Note V.

[15] See above discussion of Mt 6:14 f., p. 123 and *cf.* Mt 5:23 f.

[16] See above, p. 108 on the omission of the Importunate Friend (Lk 11:5–8) and the Rich Fool (Lk 12:16–21).

respect as "commandments," or even as narrative not supposed to be fictitious. Neither of Mt nor of S can it be imagined that the writer entertained the purpose "to make a collection of them." The nearest approach to this is Mt's expansion of Mk's three examples of the "hiding the mystery of the kingdom" to a total of seven in 13:1–50. But even the chapter of Parables of the Kingdom is not formed to complete a collection. Mt only seeks to emphasize a particular doctrine, that of the "hardening of Israel" which the use of parables is supposed to prove.

It probably misrepresents the intention even of L, often spoken of as distinguished by the great group of "story" parables he supplies to Lk, to think of him as "making a collection" of these. Doubtless the author of this rich source took special delight in parable as one of the best means of setting forth the teaching of Jesus; he may even have had better appreciation than others of the literary beauty of some of Jesus' story-parables. If L be recognized as a real intermediate link between S and Lk this writer (L) takes the same road as Lk in using the biographic form as best adapted to evangelism, instead of the gnomic preferred by Mt. But if we may judge by the freedom with which L treats his material (*cf.* Lk 15:11–32 with Mt 21:28–31 and see above, p. 112) and is himself in turn treated by Lk, the historic motive was in L and Lk alike entirely subordinate to the religious. There was no effort to "collect," there were simply differences as to the extent and manner of using *illustration.*

With these prefatory remarks we may address ourselves to the question whether P^{mt} contains material in the shape of parable which is "more or less congruous and *in pari materia*" with Q. If in addition reasonable explanation can be given for omission by Lk the passage in question will offer as much evidence for ascription to S as is possible for P material.

We are not here concerned with S parables found in P^{lk} such as the Importunate Friend (Lk 11:5–8) or the Rich Fool (Lk 12:16–21) which it has been shown were probably omitted by Mt either as intrinsically objectionable, or to free the lessons they introduce for readier inclusion in his agglutinated Discourse. Other Lukan parables ascribable to the L source, were probably unknown to Mt. We are concerned solely with parables in P^{mt} which by position, affinity of content, or otherwise might be ascribable to S if omission by Lk can be accounted for. Of such we discover but one, the Dissatisfied Wage-earners, or, as Hawkins entitles it, "the Labourers in the Vineyard" (Mt 20:1–16).

As regards position it will be noted that this parable is not appended, like so many in Mt, to the close of his Discourses, but stands in the midst of a Mk group whose theme is Grace vs. Law as the Way

of Life. This group consists of Children as Heirs (Mk 10:13–16 = Mt 19:13–15) and Rich Enquirer (Mk 10:17–31 = Mt 19:16–30), followed in Mk 10:35–45 = Mt 20:20–28 by the Ambitious Request of James and John. If we pass over the Mk material which next follows in Mk 10:46–52 = Mt 20:29–34, Mk 11:1–33 = Mt 21:1–27 we come to another "Vineyard Parable," Mt's version of the Elder and Younger Son (= Lk 15:11–32 L?), and immediately after to a third "vineyard parable," the Mk parable of the Usurping Husbandmen (Mk 12:1–12 = Mt 21:33–46). The affinity of the Dissatisfied Wage-earners with the Elder and Younger Son, the nearest possible Q material, is so close that the two might well be regarded as forming twin parables.

Again, as regards contents, the real moral of the parable of the Dissatisfied Wage-earners is not that which Mt takes such pains to impress upon the reader by enclosing it between two identical sayings "The last shall be first and the first last." The enclosing verses show that Mt understands the parable in the sense of his colophon to the third "vineyard parable" 21:43: "The kingdom of God shall be taken away from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." But this does injustice to the parable in its intrinsic sense. It is not a mere prophecy of the coming overturn, which will place the kingdom in the hands of the despised Nazarenes making the "last first," but is really an illustration of the principle inculcated in the Mk group to which Mt attaches it, the principle of divine grace as the only basis of admission to life eternal.[17] Now this is distinctly a principle of S and *not* of Mt. It is sharply advanced, however, in the parables of the Elder and Younger Son (Q and L) and in the Lk logion on Meriting Reward (Lk 17:7–10). The parable of the Dissatisfied Wage-earners is therefore *in pari materia* with Q. We may class it as S^p if omission by Lk can be accounted for. Of the many paradoxes of Jesus' teaching none, perhaps, was more unacceptable to post-apostolic neo-legalism than the doctrine of unmerited grace. Indeed even the modern mind, schooled in the principles of the trade-unions, rebels at the attitude of the vineyard-owner in paying an unequal wage from mere "sovereign grace." We cannot wonder therefore at omission by Lk, and only marvel at the curious misapplication by which Mt makes it admissible. In the case of this single parable from P^{mt} we do seem, then, to have grounds for ascription to S.

Per contra nothing distinctive of S appears in the parable of the Unmerciful Servant (Mt 18:23–35). On the contrary, its position closing the Discourse of Book IV, its content elaborating Mt's favor-

[17] B. Weiss points out a further affinity with the Mk group in the teaching that grace admits no distinction of reward; *cf.* Mk 10:29–31.

ite maxim [18] is the exact equivalent of Mt 6:14 f. (R), and there is no definable reason why Lk should have omitted it if found in S.

The question remains whether P^{mt} furnishes any material requiring us to posit a document M between S and Mt, as L is supposed to have intervened between S and Lk; or whether the remaining P material not definitely assignable to N or R may be considered fully subsumed under the designation O. Full discussion of this must be reserved for Appended Note VIII, but a few observations may be made at this point.

We have seen above that oral tradition is amply sufficient to account for the two short parables of Hid Treasure and Costly Pearl appended by Mt to the Mk group. Just the same reasoning applies, of course, to the closing (seventh) parable of the group (Sorting the Catch, Mt 13:47–50). This parable applies the figure of the Fishing of Men (Mk 1:17; *cf.* L, Lk 5:1–11) to Mt's favorite warning, the sifting out the hearts of men before the judgment seat. In this case, as in the Interpretation of the Tares (verses 36–43), we have the additional proof of a full set of R's stereotyped eschatological phrases for "the End of the World"; *cf.* verses 40–43 with 49 f., 22:11–14, and 25:31–46. Only the appending of an *eighth* parable in 13:51 f., perhaps favors Streeter's distinction of two stages, M and Mt, in the redactional process. But the content of 13:51 f., is of the very bone and flesh of R^{mt}.

The work of R in supplementing this closing discourse of the Galilean ministry is significant because of the parallel it supplies for his completion of the final discourse at Jerusalem, fifth and last of the series. Further comparison with the second and fourth discourses will show the same method and the same interest predominant throughout. The Mission of the Twelve, closing in 10:40–42 with the words "shall in no wise lose his reward," supplements the promise of Mk 9:37, by adding in verse 41 what would appear to be a current saying, perhaps rabbinic, on reward for hospitality shown to "prophets and righteous men." [19] The remainder is an elaboration of Mk 9:41, which is used again as the nucleus of the great depiction of the Judgment of the Son of Man in "the end of the world." Discourse IV on Duty toward Church Members has an analogous ending in the parable of the Unforgiving Debtor (18:23–35). The student who has observed R's supplement to the Lord's Prayer in 6:14 f., and has noted his free use of Ecclus. 28:1–7 there and supplementation in 22:11–14 of the parable of the Slighted Invitation, will not

[18] *Cf.* J. A. Robinson, *Study of the Gospels*, p. 100, "Mt manifests more concern than the other evangelists for forgiveness within the Christian brotherhood."

[19] For the phrase *cf.* 13:17.

need to be told that the building up from the single Q phrase "Forgive us our trespasses, for we also forgive everyone that is indebted to us" of a complete parable such as that of the Unforgiving Debtor is quite within the capacity of R.

Correspondingly the expansion of the Q parables of Watchfulness (Lk 12:35 f.) and the Closing Door (Lk 13:25) into the Ten Virgins (Mt 25:1–13) and the composition of the closing depiction of the Judgment of the Son of Man (25:31–46), with only Mk. 9:41 as an authentic text, give a basis for estimating the proportion of nuclear O necessary to the production of Matthean R. This estimate will be applicable to the question whether a "fourth document" M is really required to account for the variations of Mt from Lk's version of S.

The foregoing illustrations of the wide limits which R permits himself in the expansion, allegorization and supplementation of parables, material which he clearly regards as haggadic illustration rather than halachic "commandment," reduce very greatly the occasion for positing an M source. Little has thus far appeared in favor of the theory beyond the limits of the Sermon on the Mount, and this will receive further consideration in the Special Introduction to Book I, and Appended Note VIII. Dislocation of the original "literary symmetry" of Mt 6:1–18 is no greater than the dislocations effected in the Antitheses of the Higher Righteousness which precede (5:21–48). A version M of the Sermon employed and expanded by R^{mt} *may* be found a necessary assumption. If so, shall we consider that this M version stands closer to the S represented by the Q material? Or shall we hold Lk responsible, as having resorted to L for at least a part of his variant report? These questions must be left open for the present.

We must also leave open the question of N. The Special Introductions to Preamble and Epilogue will afford opportunity for discussion of the questions raised by the so-called "Reflection-citations" (*Reflexionscitate*), the Nativity stories, the Petrine Supplements of Book IV, and the Apocryphal Additions of the Epilogue. It is true that this material has claims to be regarded as drawn from oral tradition rather than from any written document. Conrady [20] and Dieterich [21] have pointed out the incoherence of the individual parts of the birth stories as indicative of such an origin. Soltau adduces distinctions of style and language characterizing all four elements of N material. In his view these represent R himself. It is generally admitted that these four elements have a certain unity, and this entitles them to separate consideration apart from general classification under O.

[20] *Quelle der kanonischen Kindheitsgeschichte*, 1900.

[21] "Die Weisen aus dem Morgenlande," *Kleine Schriften*, p. 272.

CHAPTER X

TRAITS OF THE REDACTOR

The Gospel of Mt should be printed with a portrait of the author as a frontispiece. For such an unconscious portrait has been furnished by the evangelist himself in the words placed in Jesus' mouth as a conclusion to Book III. An eighth parable is appended in Mt 13:51 f. to the group of seven in which Jesus commits to the Twelve the "mystery of the kingdom" which had been vainly preached to the unrepentant cities of Galilee. "Have ye understood all these things?" Jesus now asks of the disciples. On their assent he continues,

> Therefore every scribe who hath been made a disciple to the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is a householder, who bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old.

The comparison reminds us of the commendation bestowed by Johanan ben Zacchai on Eliezer ben Hyrcanus, an eminent *talmid* ("disciple"): "Eliezer is like a well plastered cistern that allows no drop of water to escape." [1] The ideal is identical though Mt's illustration of the "householder" seems to be suggested by Jesus' application of the term to his disciples in the Mission of the Twelve (Mt 10:25).

Again R has provided no preface to state his object and his qualifications for the task assumed. It was needless. At the close of the entire work he has made his purpose and ideal clear in Jesus' final words addressed to the Eleven as they are sent forth on their mission to evangelize the world. They are to convey to men the message of salvation by "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I command you."

Nearly all expositors of this Jewish-christian writing take note of its neo-legalistic conception of "the gospel" and its effort to perpetuate the scribal system in the Church by bestowing on Peter an office corresponding to the presidency of a college of scribes (16:18 f.) and formulating for the Christian rabbi his principles of behavior in comparison with those of the teacher of the Synagogue (23:1–12). Still there was much occasion for giving precision to the somewhat vague outline and further backing to the proof when in 1928 von Dobschütz supplied the article already referred to entitled

[1] *Sayings of the Fathers*, II, 11.

"Matthäus als Rabbi und Katechet." [2] In this article the careful student will find a summary of the traits which justify the terms applied. Mt is "a converted rabbi." His ideal, his methods, his stereotyped phraseology, his delight in numerical groupings, his proverbial sayings, all show the characteristics of the trained teacher of the Synagogue. He has become a Church catechist; but he has not discarded the methods of his training nor greatly altered its ideals. It is true that his mother-tongue is neither Hebrew nor Aramaic. But that does not prevent his Gospel from being "Hebraic to the core." If one can imagine an Edersheim whose Bible is not the Hebrew text but the King James Version, one can picture the better this rabbi of the close of the first century firmly rooted to his Greek Old Testament side by side with his two Greek records of the sayings and doings of the Lord, and "bringing out of his treasure things new and old."

The thorough student who has leisure and patience to prove all things will gladly avail himself of such data as those listed by von Dobschütz in support of his characterization of R^{mt}. Indeed every reader will wish to be informed where such statistics are available, for in each individual passage here ascribed to R there will be need of verification in respect to peculiarities of language, motive, and method. Fortunately the task is made easier by the strong propensity of Mt already noted to adopt from the sources he employs certain telling expressions such as the epithet "half-believer" (ὀλιγόπιστος) or the phrase "there shall be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth," phrases which are thereafter repeated in stereotyped form. The recurrence of these (and they are in constant recurrence) is a strong indication of R's hand. Moreover the vast pains taken in over a century of minute study of the problem has furnished standard tables which need not here be transcribed, though a summary of results is indispensable.

Much can be determined concerning the general characteristics of our first canonical evangelist by mere observation of the structure and salient traits of his compilation, and in particular his treatment of Mk. To a remarkable extent a consensus of critics has already been attained as to such characteristics as his neo-legalistic motive, his Jewish-christian mode of conceiving the gospel message, his bitterness toward "scribes and Pharisees" and the unbelievers of his own people, his emphasis on proof from the Scriptures, his apocalyptic type of eschatology and warnings of judgment to come, his special interest in moral regulation and discipline in the Church, particularly forgiveness as between brethren, his insistence upon "good works" as the criterion between true and false teachers as well as

[2] *ZNW*, XXXVII, 3/4 (1928), pp. 338–348.

the only dependence for salvation in the coming day of messianic judgment, his fear and hatred of the teachers of "lawlessness." [3] All these characteristics have been already amply illustrated, and are indeed matters of general consent. No further proof of this unanimity should be required than a comparison in various Commentaries and critical works of those passages which by common consent are designated redactional (R). At the same time to read these supplements, colophons, and corrections consecutively cannot fail to produce a vivid sense of unity, the conviction that our relatively late and wholly unknown evangelist is more than a skilful compiler and editor. He has blended diverse elements together into a unit, a whole which is more than a mosaic. It has both a pattern and a spirit of its own.

Nevertheless critical agreement is not a sufficient demonstration, and the agreement itself is not unqualified. A criterion is still lacking to the demonstration and one of special value because of its objectivity, the criterion of style and language. R^{mt} has not only distinctive traits of motive and character, distinctive methods of arrangement, selection, and treatment of his material, but a distinctive style, vocabulary, and phraseology. Once these have been adequately studied and an approximation to unanimity attained sufficient to guarantee the impartiality of the standard, coincidence of these results with those obtained on other grounds will enable us to say with reasonable confidence of this disputed passage or that, "This has, or has not, flowed from the pen of R, the redactor himself." For more than half a century the evidence has accumulated, one scholar after another adding items to the list. Of German studies none is more thorough or convincing than Wernle's.[4] The most recent, convenient, and objective in English are those of Sir John Hawkins in the second edition of *HS*. We shall avail ourselves chiefly of these.

As before, in the case of determination of Q, Sir John himself is first to warn against too mechanical an application of his own data. Reliable criticism is not to be based on word-counting alone, it seeks through the letter acquaintance with the spirit. It is not enough to learn through the concordance that Mt has a special fondness for δίκαιος and connected terms such as δικαιοῦν and δικαιοσύνη; one must appreciate the relation of this fact to his constant emphasis

[3] *Cf.* G. F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era*, Vol. I. "Age of the Tannaim," p. 92: "They (the Nazarenes) were as averse as the rabbis themselves to its antinomian trend." The reference is to the "acute Hellenization" of Greek Christianity.

[4] *Synopt. Frage*, 1899, pp. 109–195. Since the above was written Schlatter has contributed the exhaustive study of *Der Evangelist Matthäus* (1929). See Appended Note VII.

upon a type of moral and religious teaching in which the impending messianic judgment based upon "good works" occupies the foreground. To know what the term "righteousness" means to R has an important bearing on his attachment of a supplementary clause "and his righteousness" to the Q exhortation "Seek ye first the kingdom of God" (6:33; *cf.* Lk 12:31). We realize, as we bring this slight supplement into line with the whole series of similar supplements throughout the Gospel, culminating in the great closing scene of the Messianic Judgment, 25:31–46, that what Mt means by this "righteousness" of God, the thing to be sought next to the kingdom as the chief end of life, is not so much the likeness of sons to the Father which is the theme of the Q discourse, but the *approval* of God which gives assurance of acquittal in the day of judgment. As has been acutely observed the term δικαιοσύνη in Mt can in most cases be best rendered "Salvation." (See Appended Note X.) S looks inward for his definition, R looks forward.

Words, then, must be not only counted but weighed and interpreted for quality of meaning and purpose of application. With this object in view, and leaving particular application of the data to our special Introductions, we may group together some of the statistics furnished, indicative of the individual characteristics and predilections of R^{mt}.

1. One of the most important to determine of these is his mother-tongue. Greek, no doubt, but is he not equally at home in Aramaic, or Hebrew, or both? However Jewish in feeling, origin, and attitude toward Scripture, the language in which R seems to feel most at home is that in which he writes, from whose written sources he draws, the language into which he translates for his readers' benefit even such words of Hebrew and Aramaic as Emmanuel (1:23), Golgotha (27:33) and Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani (27:46). In the last two cases he is transcribing Mk, though in most cases he simply avoids the use of Markan Aramaisms such as Boanerges (Mk 3:17). *Talitha qumi* (Mk 5:41), *qorban* (Mk 7:11), Bar-Timaeus (Mk 10:46), and even Abba (Mk 14:36). It is perhaps an oversight that he fails to clarify the sense of the angel's command to name the child "Jesus" in 1:21 by explaining its meaning to be "savior," just as we may suppose it to be in 27:6 where he tolerates κορβανᾶν, avoided in transcribing Mk 7:11. But it is hard to imagine a Christian *milieu* without sufficient linguistic knowledge to understand 1:21 unaided.

From the fact that R makes the Greek Gospel of Mk and a Greek version of the discourses of Jesus his two principal sources we might expect the Bible in his own hands and assumed to be in the hands of his readers to be, as in fact it is, the Septuagint version (LXX). However, certain exceptions require to be noted, because critics are by no means of one mind as to their significance. We refer to a cer-

tain number of his Scripture quotations, which seem to be independent of the Septuagint.

Variations from the standard LXX text may have different causes. They may be due (a) to editorial adaptation, usually explicable without difficulty from the context; or (b) to the freedom of *memoriter* citation on the part either of the evangelist or the source employed; or (c) there may be dissimilarity from the LXX, with or without affinity to the Hebrew, explicable on neither of the two grounds just mentioned. This third class of variations is important because of its rarity and in some cases may make it probable that the writer's reliance was on the Hebrew Bible, a fact which if demonstrable has great significance.

The group of quotations in Mt belonging to this third type has been claimed since Jerome's time as evidence that R^{mt} himself resorted as a rule to the Hebrew text. Allen, on the contrary, points out (*ICC*, p. lxii) that

> (*a*) in the quotations borrowed by him from Mk the editor shows a tendency to assimilate the language more closely to the LXX. The single exception of change in favor of the Hebrew is Mk 12:30=Mt 22:37. For such assimilation, see Mt 13:15 καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς for Mk's καὶ ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς; Mt 15:8 ὁ λαὸς οὗτος for Mk's οὗτος ὁ λαός; Mt 19:5 adds καὶ (προσκολληθήσεται) τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ; Mt 22:32 adds εἰμί; Mt. 26:31 adds τῆς ποίμνης. So LXX A (*i.e.*, Cod. Alexandrinus), Mt 27:46 ἵνα τί for εἰς τί.
>
> (*b*) In nine quotations not borrowed from Mk, viz. 4:4, 7, 10; 5:21, 27, 38, 43a; 9:13=12:7; 21:16, there is a general agreement with the LXX, except in καὶ οὐ, 9:13=12:7, which agrees with Heb. and LXX AQ (Codd. Alexandrinus and Marchalianus) against LXX B (Cod. Vaticanus).

From this evidence Allen infers that the quotations which show influence from the Hebrew are borrowed. Contrariwise Soltau, in a very thorough discussion in *ZNW*, I (1900), pp. 219–248 comes to the conclusion that a distinction must indeed be recognized, but that the writer who shows acquaintance with the Hebrew and in other respects manifests a more narrowly Jewish-christian point of view is he who molds the work to its present form, to whom we must therefore apply the designation R; whereas the main substance of the Gospel is a blend of Mk with S, a composition of more Hellenistic type to which R has prefixed this Preamble and attached at somewhat ill-chosen places a series of supplements and Scripture fulfilments grouped together in the present volume under the designation N. Streeter's conjectured M source for Mt would correspond fairly to Soltau's Mt^{ii}.

We shall have occasion in our Special Introduction to the Preamble and in Appended Note VII to decide between these two possibilities. In the meantime it will be universally agreed that the writer

who combines Mk with S has Greek for his mother-tongue, perhaps is really master of no other. At least he attempts no correction of Mk's erroneous treatment of ὡσαννά, which Mk construes with a dative as if an ascription of praise like Hallelujah. Mt transfers this misconstruction to his pages unchanged. Leaving for later consideration the question of a possible N source and its nature and relation to Mk on the one side and to R^{mt} on the other, we may endorse and even re-enforce the arguments of Allen in favor of a compiler of the other two sources who, however Jewish-minded in other particulars, was a Greek-speaking Christian with thoroughly "catholic" sympathies.

For even the slight exception noted by Allen to his general rule that R assimilates the quotations he borrows from Mk to the LXX loses force in view of the fact that the passage quoted, being from the *Shem'a*, could not be expected to take any other form than that of the evangelist's daily use. Thus the mere substitution of ἐν for ἐκ in Mt 22:37 could have no significance; for in words so familiar it is improbable that the transcriber's pen would be guided by anything save common use and wont.

But also, under Allen's list (*a*) of Markan scripture quotations assimilated to LXX by Mt certain further items of considerable importance should be added. Thus in 19:18 f. Mt is careful to bring Mk's loose citation of Ex. 20:12–16 into more exact agreement with LXX. Again in 27:34 he inserts μετὰ χολῆς to bring that of Mk 15:23 into closer agreement with Ps. 68:22 LXX.

Under (*b*) also the evidence is stronger than Allen makes apparent. For R not only constructs his genealogy, as Allen shows, by use of the LXX, but depends on the LXX for his proof of the Virgin Birth [5] (1:23), as well as for extensive quotations made on his own account. These are 13:14 f., coincident throughout its total of 48 words with the LXX,[6] and 21:16, whose 7 words also all coincide with the LXX.

For Allen's theory of the "eleven quotations introduced by a formula" we must refer the reader to our Appended Note V. His results, so far as they bear on the general question of the language of R's Bible, are as follows: "Scripture" means to R the Greek Old Testament. Traces of the Hebrew text remain in some of his quotations, most of these being found in the preliminary story of the Nativity but some later in the Gospel. This, however, is not because R^{mt} himself resorts to the Hebrew but because he has taken his quotations from other sources just as he takes them from Mk, that is, without alteration except where special interest dictated the change.

[5] See below, Chapter XI.

[6] Hawkins (*HS*, p. 156) counts one of these 48 as "not in LXX." Even this exception is doubtful. Some texts of LXX show absolute agreement.

R^{mt} translates, or transcribes, quotations along with the context, though naturally he falls easily into the LXX wording, especially in the more familiar passages. In other words the Hebraisms occasionally found in the quotations of Mt are there in spite of R's tendencies and not because of them.

The importance of this observation lies in the fact that we can now use the traces of influence from the Hebrew in quotations as an evidence for the identification of sources, and these sources more probably written than oral.

Application of this test to the quotations of S as a whole may be deferred to our Appended Note V, leaving for consideration here only the most salient example, the quotation from Mal. 3:1 given in identical terms not only in Q (Mt 11:10=Lk 7:27) but also in Mk 1:2, where it forms the only exception among more than 70 instances to the rule that in Mk quotations are based on the LXX.

The Q quotation is made freely, and from memory. This may be inferred from the blending in it of elements from Ex. 23:20, and from the use of terms independent of the LXX. Mk is here clearly drawing from S. This appears from the fact that he does not know the real source of the passage quoted, but mistakenly ascribes it to "Isaiah." He also misapplies it to mean that the Baptist prepares the way for *Jesus*. From this secondary form we may turn, then, to the primary. In this case we have freedom of quotation, without dependence on LXX phraseology, and in addition a suggestion that in its original form S used the Hebrew text; for κατασκευάσει (Mt, Mk, Lk) "shall set in order" is certainly closer to the Hebrew than ἐπιβλέψεται (LXX) "shall look over." Other Q quotations are indecisive.

The case for influence from the Hebrew is much clearer where the series of quotations is considered which begins with the Nativity group and continues at intervals throughout the Gospel of Mt in its Markan sections. German critics have termed it the series of *Reflexionscitate*. To this group is due the impression that R's quotations are drawn from the Hebrew text. The formula by which they are commonly introduced is "Now this took place that the word might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet," or the like. From this the inference has been hastily drawn that Mt used a collection of "Testimonies" similar to those we know to have been current in the second and third centuries. Of course if these quotations are indeed based on the Hebrew text while R himself uses the LXX some outside source must have supplied them; nor would a merely oral source suffice. The question of its nature and type remains for separate discussion in our Special Introduction to the Preamble. In the meantime the evidence already considered is sufficient to establish

a rule which might have been expected a priori. The scripture quotations of R^{mt} are from the Bible of his own and his readers' mother-tongue, the Septuagint. Those which he draws from Mk are almost invariably based on the Greek, and in certain cases are even assimilated to it more closely. The quotations which R draws from S seem to show in some cases surviving traces of use of the Hebrew text. The quotations which he draws from the source to which we have applied the designation N show such influence quite unmistakably. Such traces of the Hebrew text tend of course to be submerged by LXX phraseology because writers as familiar with the language of the Greek Bible as our evangelists would find it hard either to translate quotations from the Old Testament or even transcribe them from another's translation, without lapsing continually into the familiar phraseology of their own Bible. Any who have tried translating a passage from the French or German Bible will know how easy it is to slip into the familiar wording of the Authorized or Revised Version. Such ground as we have for regarding a given citation as derived from S or N comes from the degree of coloration from the Hebrew which R^{mt} has *permitted to remain.*

2. Sections II–IV in Hawkins' discussion deal with "The Shortening of Narratives in Mt" (pp. 158–160), "Signs of Compilation in Mt" (pp. 161–163), and "Traces of Numerical Arrangement" (pp. 163–167), It is more important to supplement Section V on "The Transference and Repetition of Formulas" (pp. 168–173) than to delay upon characteristics that are well known. No less than fifteen instances of Mt's tendency to repeat his own phrases are listed by Sir John, and to these are added, on p. 171, nineteen (!) borrowed "formulas" adopted from the sources. We may quote the comment:

> A careful examination of such cases certainly leaves the impression that the mind of Mt was so familiar with these collocations of words that he naturally reproduced them in other parts of his narrative, besides the places in which they occurred in his sources. It is to be observed that these apparent reproductions often occur earlier in the Gospel than do the apparently original occurrences of the formulas, which seems to indicate that Mt drew them from his memory of his sources and not from documents before him.

The inference drawn by von Dobschütz from this little-noted phenomenon is also just. R^{mt} transfers to Christian writings as a catechist the same methods as characterize the rabbi.

The five-fold "transition link" by which R^{mt} leads over at the close of each Book from discourse to narrative is the most conspicuous example of this "stereotyping" habit, and merits some further attention from its typical character. Its first occurrence is at the end

of the first Discourse (Mt 7:28), where it occupies a position in strict parallelism with Lk 7:1, which leads forward after the same discourse. As proof that it is not originated but "borrowed" by Mt Sir John observes that "ἐγένετο followed by a finite verb is only found in these 5 places in Mt, while it occurs 22 times in Lk (also twice in Mk and nowhere else in New Testament)." [7] The case is strengthened when we observe that the β text of Lk 7:1 has exactly the same form as Mt adopts in all five "transition links," καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν.

Mt makes slight changes in this formula to adapt it to the individual context. He does the same with other phrases borrowed from both Mk and Q. Thus "kingdom of God" is changed (with rabbinic avoidance of the divine name) to "kingdom of heaven"; but in four cases the original is retained because change would have altered the sense. Hence we have "kingdom of God" in Mt 12:28; 19:24; 21:31 and 43.[8] Mt adopts in 11:13=Lk 16:16 the phrase "the prophets and the Law" and continues to use it in the Lukan form "Law and prophets" in 5:17; 7:12, and 22:40. He does likewise with the epithet ὀλιγόπιστος,[9] which he borrows from S in 6:30=Lk 12:28 and continues to use in 8:26; 14:31, and 16:8, not to mention ὀλιγοπιστία in 17:20. Especially congenial to his feeling is the phrase descriptive of the disappointed envy of the excluded sons of the kingdom in the parable of the Near-shut Door (Mt 8:11 f.=Lk 13:28) "there shall be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth." This is repeated in 13:42, 50; 22:13; 24:51; 25:30. In this case we can be sure that the repetition is due to the phrase-making of R^{mt}, for the gesture of jealous rage, gnashing of teeth, is appropriate in the original first instance, but inappropriate in the later ones. Other kindred phrases applying to the punishment of the wicked which R takes up and repeats are "hewn down and cast into the fire" (repeated from 3:10=Lk 3:9 in 7:19), or "cast into the furnace of fire" (13:42, 50; *cf.* 25:41). Obviously the stereotyped formula has no small importance as a note of identification applicable to R.

3. Words and phrases "characteristic" of Mt are defined in *HS* (p. 3) to be such as "occur at least four times in this Gospel," and are either (a) "not found at all in Mk or Lk," or (b) "found in Mt at least twice as often as in Mk and Lk together." Of such 95 are collected, classified, and tabulated by Sir John on pp. 3–9, as against 151 in Lk and 41 in Mk. Mt is not a finished writer or Greek stylist such as Lk, yet he shows himself quite competent to handle ef-

[7] We should observe, however that Mt allows the Semitic construction καὶ ἐγένετο καί with finite verb to stand in 9:10.

[8] Also in 6:33 in inferior Mss.

[9] Overlooked in Hawkins' list, but see his p. 6.

fectively the simple variety of *κοινή* Greek current in Syria, and to exercise a kind of editorial improvement on the relatively rude style of Mk.

However, not all of these "characteristic" words are Mt's own. As with the borrowed formulas the distribution proves that some should be credited originally to Mt's sources. Mk is of course excluded from the survey by Hawkins' definition of "characteristic," also those portions of S included under Q. But portions of S peculiar to Mt, such as the Antitheses of the Sermon on the Mount (Mt 5:17–43), may have furnished their quota, as well as the source N of which we have no trace outside of Mt. Indeed the contribution of N is so marked that Sir John in his *HS* tables reserves a special column for the 48 verses of chapters 1–2. The remainder of Mt's "single tradition" contains about 290 verses. Two of the three Remarks subjoined by Sir John to his carefully prepared tables are so significant on this point of distinguishing between words "characteristic" of Mt because supplied from his own vocabulary and words adopted from possible sources that they may be here transcribed *verbatim*.

B

Chapters 1–2 contain 48 of the 1,068 verses of this Gospel, *i.e.*, only about one twenty-second part of the whole. But they contain considerably more than one-ninth of the occurrences of the "characteristic" words and phrases, viz. 107 out of 904. This is partly accounted for by the use of *γεννάω* 40 times in the genealogy; but even if those 40 items are deducted from both numbers, chapters 1–2 are found to contain upwards of one-thirteenth of such occurrences, viz. 67 out of 864. It appears, then, that these "characteristic" words and phrases are used considerably more freely in these two chapters than in the rest of the book.

C

Taking the whole of the "peculiar" or unparalleled matter in this Gospel, including chapters 1–2, it fills about 338 out of the 1,068 verses, *i.e.*, less than one-third, which would be 356 verses. It thus appears that the occurrences of "characteristic" words and phrases are very much more abundant in the "peculiar" than in the "common" portions of the Gospel; for there are 482 of them in the "peculiar" division and only 422 of them in the "common" division, while the latter is more than twice as large as the former.

It should be observed, however, that several of the words which do most in producing this predominance (*e.g.*, *ἀποδιδωμι*, *γάμος*, *γεννάω*, *ζιζάνιον*, *ὀμνύω*, *τάλαντον*) are words which are required by the subject-matter, and which therefore are not important as evidences of style.

Clearly these two Remarks both favor the hypothesis of a special source for Mt, and not merely an oral source, since oral tradition

would scarcely be reflected in distinctions of style. The distribution, so largely aggregating the peculiarities in chapters 1–2, is not incompatible with Soltau's theory identifying N with R, but as we shall see when comparison is made between the "characteristic" words and phrases of chapters 1–2 and those of the supplements attached to narrative sections throughout the Gospel, the phenomena point rather to a particular source, oral or written. This comparison may be made more conveniently in the Special Introduction to the Preamble.

A careful study of the table of "characteristic" Matthean words and phrases on pp. 4–8 of *HS* will enable the reader to make a further distinction of value for the determination of R. Disregarding "stereotyped" phrases there are 14 of the total of 95 "characteristic" words and phrases which Sir John has distinguished by an asterisk as specially significant. Of these a few, such as the connective phrase τότε ὁ Ἰησοῦς, show by their general distribution throughout the Gospel and their grammatical nature that they should be considered strictly characteristic of R himself, as against others which he may have taken over from S or N. These few we may well enumerate with some comment in addition to that supplied by Sir John to most of them on pp. 30–34. Among the 14 specified the following appear to characterize especially the compiler of the Gospel: ἀναχωρέω, βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἰδού after gen. absolute, λεγόμενος, used with names, Πατήρ applied to God with possessive pronoun or adjectival distinction, πληρόω used of Scriptures, προσέρχομαι, ῥηθέν (and once ῥηθείς), τί σοι, or ὑμῖν, δοκεῖ;, τότε, ὑποκριτής and ὥσπερ. Some of these are merely favorite words or tricks of style; others such as Πατὴρ οὐράνιος, βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, πληρόω and ὑποκριτής, may have a bearing on the evangelist's doctrine or environment. All are serviceable for the differentiation of R from his material. The task is a delicate one, and in disputed cases calls for both tact and scholarship. We may conclude our discussion of its applicability by a typical example.

Very different views are taken of the relative originality of the Lord's Prayer in its briefer Lukan form, consisting of five petitions, or its longer, Matthean form, which has seven. B. Weiss, for example, will not allow the possibility which others contend for that R^{mt} should venture in so sacred a context to extend the form which he found in S by introducing interpretative clauses such as "Thou who art in heaven," or "thy will be done, as in heaven so on earth," or "but deliver us from evil." In such disputed cases it is well to apply the test of "characteristic" words and phrases. The result is expressed by Sir John in a parenthetic comment attached on p. 32 to his discussion of the "characteristic" Matthean phrase

ὁ πονηρός or τὸ πονηρόν "of the evil one" or "evil." The comment is as follows:

> We have now seen that the parts of the Lord's Prayer which are peculiar to Mt contain three expressions which are "characteristic" of him, viz. γενηθήτω, Πατήρ ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς and this one (τοῦ πονηροῦ).

Application of the test of Language and Style would seem to demand a certain revision of the rule which maintains that R^{mt} repressed his redactional activity where logia of the Lord were concerned; also of the theory that variants in the Matthean from the Lukan form of Q must be ascribed, if the Lukan form be really the more authentic, not to R^{mt} himself, but to a hypothetical M, composer of an intermediate form of S. The test of Language and Style points to R^{mt} himself as personally responsible.

PART II

SPECIAL INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER XI

THE PREAMBLE. N AND R

The Gospel of Mk has been well described as "the prolongation backward of Paul's 'word of the cross.'" Its object, like Paul's, is to present Jesus as the glorified Son of God, but the means employed is to trace the steps which led up to the great tragedy. Such account as it once gave of the rise of the resurrection faith has disappeared, eclipsed by other narratives more serviceable to primitive apologetic. All the Gospels follow the general outline of Mk, which doubtless represents, as claimed by early tradition, the substance of Peter's preaching and testimony. The notable point, whose bearing on the preliminary chapters of Mt will soon appear, is that the story is developed backward. In the perspective of our evangelists the "word of the cross" is the starting point. From it they carry their report as far back as the witness of Peter permits. They even peer into the mists of the thirty or more unknown years, using a constructive imagination based on their knowledge of Jesus and their belief in his divine vocation. Always the glory of the resurrection vision casts its ray backward into the deepening obscurity.

The common starting point is best expressed by Paul at the outset of his exposition of his "gospel" (Rom. 1:1–4). Jesus, who according to the flesh had a certain claim to the messianic throne, seeing he was lineally descended from David, was miraculously revealed as the Son of God by the fact that God raised him from the dead. This, in the language of contemporary religious propaganda, would be called Paul's witness to the Epiphany of the Savior-god he preached. The phenomenon we have now to describe might be called the recession of the Epiphany-gospel with the development of tradition.

The same starting point is shown by Lk. For Acts 13:33 and 17:31 certainly give a true picture, not of Paul's earlier preaching only but of the common gospel of all primitive evangelists, when it represents Paul as declaring at Pisidian Antioch and before the Athenian Areopagus that "God hath given assurance unto all men" of the appointment of that messianic world-judge who is presently to appear "in that He hath raised him from the dead." One need only compare Paul's own description of his missionary preaching to the Thessalonians, whom he persuaded "to turn from idols to serve a living and true God, and to wait for His Son from Heaven" (I Thess.

1:10) to see how true a picture of the primitive oral gospel Lk has drawn. The Epiphany supports the Eschatology.

Peter's preaching in Acts 2–3 and 10:36–43 has indeed, as we should expect, a larger element of retrospect over Jesus' ministry in Galilee and Jerusalem; but here too the *message* is the word of the cross (10:39–42). The rest is incidental.

The Christology depicted in this apostolic preaching is a Son-of-Man doctrine, proved after the manner of I Cor. 15:1–7, where again it is expressly declared by Paul to be not his testimony alone, but that of all the witnesses. This description, like the others, centers upon an Epiphany of the Son of God "manifested" as such by the resurrection. Nor does it appear to have been thought needful at this early period to carry this divine "manifestation" further back. The beginnings of the process by which this Epiphany gospel recedes further and further in Synoptic story appear in the *haggada* (presentation by "tale") of the Transfiguration.

In the story of the Transfiguration vision and Voice from Heaven the Epiphany gospel still stands connected with the resurrection. Indeed traces remain in the *Apocalypse of Peter* and elsewhere of a time when this "revelation" to Peter and his fellow-disciples was coincident in date with the story of how Peter, after the tragedy of Calvary, "turned again" and "rallied his brethren." In the *Apocalypse of Peter* the "manifestation" is given *after* the catastrophe, to confirm the nascent faith of the disciples. But Mk and its two satellite Gospels carry back this vision-story to *precede* the journey to martyrdom. The manifestation is now given to confirm the still wavering faith of the disciples who have just acknowledged Jesus as "the Christ" and have been staggered by his prediction of the cross. Its function, therefore, is identical with that of the vision-story which introduces the career of Jesus as a whole, when he receives by vision and Voice from heaven his calling to be the Son of God, and in the Temptations repels false expectations of this calling.

Like the baptismal Epiphany the Transfiguration apocalypse gives preliminary interpretation to the story which is to follow. Those who receive the revelation on the "holy mount" are, of course, not Jesus himself, who has no need of it, but those who, after his "taking up," are to proclaim him as the glorified Son of God. For this reason they are forbidden to speak of it "till the Son of Man be risen from the dead." Also we observe that the transfiguration Epiphany corresponds much more closely than the Vocation vision with that Son-of-Man Christology which we have seen to characterize the apostolic preaching. Placed as now it carries back to the beginning of the journey to martyrdom the "manifestation of the Son of God." By this special revelation and Voice from heaven the disciples

are given their message in advance, in order that their faith may be sustained for the impending ordeal, and that afterwards they may be able to testify that their witness to the resurrection was no mere afterthought to counteract the scandal of the cross, but had been given them from heaven from the first days[1] after their acknowledgment of Jesus as "the Christ."

But the Epiphany of the Son of God is carried still further back, in terms but slightly changed, when need arises. The Sonship is now to be proved by the earlier career of Jesus in Galilee. This was "after the baptism which John preached," a period unmentioned by Paul, a period of preaching and wonder-working attested, it would seem, chiefly, if not solely, by the witness of Peter.

The story of the Galilean ministry has therefore also its Epiphany. Jesus' public work is prefaced by an account similar to that of the ancient prophets, wherein the messenger of God relates in terms of vision and Voice from heaven his vocation to his mission. Jesus' religious experience at the baptism of John, an experience which had resulted in his taking up the mission of the imprisoned prophet, is similarly related as "the beginning of the gospel." Whether by intimation from himself or by inference from the known facts of his career, the primitive tradition relates that Jesus' baptism by John had been accompanied by a Voice from heaven proclaiming him God's "Son." This, then, marks a second stage in the recession of the Epiphany gospel.

How much could be known of Jesus' inward experience in the period preceding the disciples' association with him is a question about which interpreters will differ, but there can be no disagreement as to the purpose with which the primitive evangelist has thus prefaced his story in the S^q narrative. The account of Jesus' vision at the baptism of John, the divine summons "Thou art my Son, the Beloved; upon thee my choice was fixed from eternity" is intended (especially in the secondary forms which use Ps. 2:7, or address the Baptist or the bystanders) as a miraculous "manifestation of the Son of God," whose story is thereupon related. In S, then, as well as in the *Via Crucis* of Markan narrative, the record was prefaced by its own Epiphany, the Vocation of Jesus by vision and Voice from heaven.

A third, still later stage in the process of recession of the Epiphany is represented by the prefixed chapters of Mt and Lk which supplement Mk's narrative. In diverse ways, by the use of similar but independent legends of the finding of the heaven-sent child who re-

[1] "Six days" (Lk "about eight days") is the Synoptic period of preparation for the Epiphany. In the Johannine version (Jn 1:19–2:11) we appear to have a corresponding *hexaemeron* leading up to the "manifestation."

deems the world to peace and righteousness, Mt and Lk carry it back to Jesus' birth. The annunication is now made by angels instead of God's own voice, while accompanying miracles in heaven and on earth meet the ever-increasing demand for supernatural attestation. However, in the nativity gospels it is no longer thought needful to explain the silence between the heavenly proclamation and its promulgation to the world. No divine command imposes secrecy upon the witnesses, as in the Transfiguration vision (Mk 9:9 and parallels). The Magians return to their own country, the shepherds of Bethlehem are too obscure to find acceptance for their report; the rest merely "lay up these things in their hearts" against a day when supernatural credentials may be demanded. Only to the critic do the "thirty years of silence" remain a disturbing gap in the story, especially when, as in Mt 3:1, it passes, as if without a break, from nativity to baptism, beginning its transcript of Mk with the words "And *in those days* cometh John the Baptist." To the critic this unbridged interval bears witness of the late date of the supplement; for even Lk can find but a single touching incident of Jesus' boyhood to relate, leaving free play in all the rest of the thirty years for the grotesque fancies of the apocryphal Gospels of the Infancy.

The prefixed gospels of the Nativity thus constitute a problem in themselves. Why this still further recession of the Epiphany? Whence have the circles represented by Mt 1–2 and Lk 1–3 drawn their symbolic figures?

A motive which goes at least part way toward accounting for these prefatory chapters is the correction of false beliefs. At a very early date, certainly within the limits of the first century, Mk's account of "the beginning of the gospel" had been found unsatisfactory. At least the Syrian church found it lacking in two respects: (1) It repelled the more Jewish-minded by treating well-established belief in the Davidic descent of Jesus no less slightingly than Paul, who, though he admits the fact, dismisses it as a mere concern of "the flesh" (Rom. 1:3). To Mk likewise the Son-of-David Christology is obnoxious, the notion of the royal pedigree a mere unfounded dogma of "the scribes" (Mk 12:35 ff.). But Christians of Jewish descent in Syria were not content to see the claim thus abandoned. They would retain it in a moral and symbolic sense, even if they appropriated a story of virgin birth which logically deprived it of other significance. Both Mt and Lk, accordingly, in adopting a birth-epiphany whose motive we must presently consider, prefix a genealogy of Joseph which explains the references of Paul and Mk to the title "Son of David" applied to Jesus (Rom. 1:3; Mk 10:47 f.). Each of the two pedigrees traces Joseph's ancestry to David, but curiously enough, by inconsistent lines.

(2) More serious dissatisfaction with Mk was felt by those concerned to maintain a right doctrine of divine Sonship. Mk gave too ready a foothold for doctrines of a docetic or adoptionist type, doctrines already current in the Greek-speaking church before the close of the first century, which destroyed the value of the historical Jesus by explaining his career as due to temporary "control" by a Christ-spirit. Adoptionism, the doctrine that Jesus "became" the Son of God at his baptism, was specially prevalent at Rome. The Jew Cerinthus, according to Irenaeus, rested his docetism ("apparition" doctrine) on the Gospel of Mk, admitting no other, and maintaining that the Galilean mechanic had been merely the temporary "receptacle" of the heavenly Spirit, which before the end had again withdrawn from him. Mk certainly made it easy for the West to develop an Adoptionist Christology. As interpreted by Cerinthus it seemed even to teach that the beginning of Jesus' "control" by the Spirit had been at his baptism, after which, as pointed out by Cerinthus, he "began to work miracles and to proclaim the unknown Father." Basilides, the reputed disciple of Menander at Antioch, preached a similar docetic heresy at Alexandria under Hadrian, and indeed it might well be said of the Gnostics generally that they preached a Christ who "came by water only, and not by water and by blood." Their doctrine did indeed lay all emphasis on incarnation, symbolized by baptism, to the neglect of atonement, symbolized by the sacrament of the cup. In terms of the festal calendar, which played an enormous part in the religious life of the times, the one great annual feast for Gnostics was the Epiphany, early celebrated on the very date of the Epiphany of Dionysus the Hellenistic "savior-god" (Jan. 5/6), with ceremonies repeating those of the pagan ritual. Gnostics naturally ignored or belittled the festival taken over by the Church from the Synagogue, the Passover of the Lord, the annual feast of Redemption by the blood of the cross.

With such heresies afloat the orthodox East could not well be satisfied with Mk's "beginning of the gospel." Specifically Gnostic heresy, it is true, can less easily be read between the lines of Synoptic than of Johannine literature. But "false prophets" and "false Christs," uttering the cry "I am" of the "control" and doing wonders to deceive even the elect, appear already on the horizon of Mk, and are still more conspicuous in Mt and Lk. The great doctrine at issue was that of divine Sonship, and gospel writers could not be too careful in their exposition of it.

To preserve the authentic teaching of the apostles from Adoptionism, Docetism, and kindred Gnosticizing heresies it was vital to show that the manifestation as Son of God covered Jesus' entire life. The gospel record was not to be divided into a period of thirty

or more years of normal existence at Nazareth followed by a single year of abnormal "control" by invisible agencies, agencies esteemed good or bad according as friend or foe interpreted the wonder-working. The title, with all its implications, must belong to Jesus from birth.

Here was an emphatic call for still further recession of the Epiphany gospel. Divine "epiphanies" of the type depicted in the infancy chapters of Mt and Lk were common in pagan story. Lk draws from one such, in origin traceable to Egypt. Lk's religious motive appears in the angelic promise, "therefore that holy thing that is born of thee shall be called 'the Son of God' " (Lk 1:35). Mt has a different epiphany from Lk as well as a different genealogy, but the motives are fundamentally the same. On the one hand Ebionite feeling must be conciliated, on the other Adoptionist heresy must be deprived of the weapon Mk's Gospel had made too easily available. The Son of Man must be proved from his very birth *both* Son of David *and* Son of God.

Our fourth evangelist adds still another type of epiphany gospel. For Jn Jesus' own consciousness is that of prenatal existence as the eternal Logos. But an incredulous world demands supernatural guarantees. The witness begins, accordingly, with a divine revelation to the Baptist, which that prophet openly proclaims; next Jesus in person declares his true nature to a circle of intimates, and finally seals the assurance by the miracle at Cana, where, as Jn says, "he manifested his glory and his disciples believed on him."

The Johannine Epiphany most of all bears unmistakable marks of derivation from pagan sources. Celebration of the miraculous change of water to wine at the date of the Dionysiac epiphany continued in Nabatea and Decapolis down to the close of the fourth century. It was rebaptized and celebrated in Christian shrines which had supplanted those of "the Arabian god" (Dusares-Dionysus) at Petra, Elysa, and Gerasa, stations on the Roman caravan route from Alexandria to Damascus and the East. Epiphanius christianizes the pagan ceremonial here by declaring it an annual commemoration of the miracle at Cana. At other ancient shrines of Dionysus the feast was similarly rebaptized, usually without change of date, so that "twelfth night" still remains that of Epiphany in our Christian calendars.[2]

The pagan derivation is more obvious in Jn 2:1–11 than in the epiphanies of Mt and Lk prefixed to Mk which the fourth evangelist

[2] The date seems to have been chosen in the Orient because after the night of Jan. 5/6 the earlier dawn first becomes observable after the winter solstice (Dec. 25 according to the Julian calendar). In the Dionysiac ritual the celebrants hailed the "increase of light" (αὔξει φῶς).

aims to supersede, but it is also more necessary to the Johannine incarnation doctrine. In the case of Mt and Lk the primitive theme is the *finding* of the heaven-sent babe, a form of the myth which underlies the pagan ceremony described by Epiphanius as taking place annually on the eleventh of Tybi (=Jan. 5/6) in the temple of the Virgin-mother (κορεῖον) at Alexandria, a ritual which may still be witnessed at Bethlehem today as the celebration of the Greek Christmas, just as Jerome found it practiced there late in the fourth century and recognized it as a survival from the heathen times of Hadrian. In the Lukan form shepherds are divinely directed to the cradle of the savior-god, in the Matthean the discoverers are astrologers from "the East." Both evangelists employ myths of immemorial antiquity. Celebration at Epiphany feasts made such contamination of the Christian tradition almost unavoidable.

Of course to teachers of Jewish birth the gross stories of the amours of Zeus and other gods of the Greek pantheon would be abhorrent, but in the higher sense imposed on the myths by the better Hellenistic writers virgin birth could be ascribed to Emmanuel with no more offense than to the Christian of today. Thus Plutarch, a contemporary of Mt and Lk, accepts parthenogenesis as a method of which divine power might well avail itself for bringing into the world a heaven-sent Redeemer.[3] Neither Jewish nor Christian scruples need shrink from a doctrine of the messiah's birth expressed in such terms as Plutarch employs. In the delicate language of Lk "that holy thing that is born" becomes a creation of the overshadowing power of the Most High, for "no word of His is void of power" (Lk 1:35–37; *cf.* Rom. 4:17–21; 9:6–9).

The child thus born is, according to the myth, unknown. Its hiding place must be miraculously revealed to appointed guardians, and in the ritual this scene of the finding of the heaven-sent babe is dramatized.[4] The Lukan form, in which lowly shepherds are the medium of the divine revelation, has been traced by Gressmann and Norden to Alexandrian sources recast in pre-Christian times as epiphanies of the messiah at Bethlehem. We have seen that the religious drama was enacted there under heathen control in Hadrian's time. The Matthean is clearly later than the Lukan. Its introduction of Magian astrologers from "the East," that is, of Perso-Babylonian origin, as recipients of the revelation, suggests connection with Jew-

[3] *Vita Numae* 4: "The Egyptians believe, not unplausibly, that it is not impossible for the Spirit of God to approach a woman and produce in her certain beginnings of parturition."

[4] In Jewish legend also the birth of the messiah is secret; "no man knoweth whence he is" (Jn 7:27). In rabbinic teaching (P. Volz, *Jüdische Eschatologie*, § 35, 3) and in apocalyptic vision (Rev. 12:5) the birthplace is on earth, the child is caught up to heaven. Hence his birth must be divinely "revealed."

ish, and later Jewish-christian, communities along the international highway to the Euphrates.

The indication need not be pressed. The episode of the Magi and the Star is indeed distinctive of the Epiphany of Mt vs. that of Lk. But Magians, that is, astrologers, are the common resort of all authors of similar tales of the birth of heroes throughout the Near East. Thus Cicero reports the story (*De divin.* I, 47) that in the night when the temple of Diana at Ephesus was burned Alexander was born to Olympias (a supernatural birth by divine generation according to Egyptian legend) and when daylight broke "the magians cried out that the plague and bane of Asia had been born that night." The appearance of a new star in the heavens, a phenomenon calling for interpretation by the astrologers, is a frequent accompaniment of such birth tales, as in the case of Mithridates, Alexander Severus, and others. Again a historical event of 66 A.D. has been considered by some to throw more light on the possible origin of the legend of Mt 2:1–12. This was the delegation of Parthian "magians" under Tiridates to offer worship to Nero as Mithra-incarnate at Naples. The delegation doubtless passed through Edessa and Aleppo on its way, but took, we are told, another route on its return. The event had sufficient importance to excite remark from Pliny, Dio Cassius, and Suetonius.

But mere general parallels such as these are of relatively small importance for the solution of our problem of Matthean origins. Belief was general in the appearance of astral phenomena which reveal to astrologers versed in Babylonian lore the birth of kings and heroes. What we need is evidence for the application of such beliefs by Jewish teachers to the nativity of their own great men.

Evidence of this type is adduced by Nestle,[5] who cites first the passage Num. 23:7 (LXX) as a parallel to the vague expression of Mt 2:1 "magians from *the East*." The story is that of Balak's summons of Balaam from "the East" (in both cases ἀπ' ἀνατολῶν), but in Num. 23:7 we have the parallel "from Aram" (ἐκ Μεσοποταμίας). From "the top of the rocks and the hills" of this region of "the East" Balaam has discerned the victorious Star to arise out of Jacob, and this, as we know, was regarded in Judea in 132 A.D. as a prediction of Bar Cochba the claimant to messiahship. Our Bibles of the Revised Version give as marginal references for the interpretation of Mt's expression "the East" Gen. 25:6 and I Kings 4:30. Nestle is surely justified in maintaining that Num. 23:7 is much closer, and "should not hereafter be wanting in any commentary or edition of the text."

Nestle cites also a story of the birth of Abraham from a late Jewish

[5] *ZNW*, VIII (1907), pp. 73 and 241.

midrash, the *Sefer Hayyashar*, specially noted for its reflection of Arabian legend:

> On the night when he (Abraham) was born, Terah's friends, among whom were councillors and *astrologers* of Nimrod, were feasting in his house, and on leaving at night they *observed a star*, which swallowed up four other stars from the four sides of the heavens. They forthwith hastened to Nimrod and said: "Of a certainty a lad has been born who is destined to conquer this world and the next." [6]

The story continues with a plot of the magi with the tyrant to kill the child, which Terah frustrates by hiding his son in a cave for three years.

Here, Nestle freely acknowledges, it is only "the soil on which both legends grew up" that can be indicated by the correspondence between the midrash and the Matthean birth story. This, however, as he adds, was "a Jewish soil." It would seem to have been a soil quite similar to that from which Ignatius derived his legend of the messianic star which "shone forth in the heaven above all the stars, whose light was unutterable and whose strangeness caused amazement." The soil is indeed Jewish, but far from impervious to pagan infiltration. If in the second century the magian Balaam legend can suggest to the supporters of a Jewish false messiah the title "Son of the Star" it was still potent in the fifth century to imbue Christian legend with the story of how the Persian magi "knew the star" of Bethlehem.

The Jewish origin of the nativity stories of Mt was more clearly shown by G. H. Box in his article in the *ZNW* for 1905 (VI, 1, pp. 80–101) entitled "The Gospel Narratives of the Nativity and the alleged influence of Heathen Ideas." To this well-known authority the Preamble of Mt is an agglomerate from a single hand, "the compiler of the First Gospel." It "exhibits in a degree that can hardly be paralleled elsewhere in the New Testament the characteristic features of Jewish Midrash or Haggādā."

Study of Box's data leaves no doubt that the episodes in ch. 2 "display unmistakable midrashic features." Moreover the underlying Jewish tales do belong to the legendary story of Moses rather than Abraham; for "the episode of the return from Egypt narrated in verses 20 and 21 is clearly modelled upon the LXX of Ex. 4:19, 20 (the return of Moses from Midian to Egypt)." Box finds reasons indeed to question the contention of Wünsche and Schechter that the episode of the star is a "homiletical illustration of Num. 24:17 ('There shall come forth a star out of Jacob') which the Targumim (of Onkelos and of Jerusalem) refer to the star of the Messiah." But at least the targums prove that the roots of the Matthean Epiphany

[6] See *Jewish Encycl.*, Vol I, p. 86.

gospel extend to the Synagogue. It is the question of locality and date for this Jewish influence which interests us now, and on this point Box's final comment on Mt 2:19–23 especially merits our attention:

> The evangelist belonged to a Christian community whose members bore the common designation of *Nazarene* (the characteristically oriental name for Christian). . . . It is worth noting also that the significance of the allusion to the dictum of the prophets "He shall be called a Nazarene" can only be elucidated by reference to the Hebrew messianic terms *neçer*, *çemah*, and *nazir*. In the LXX equivalents the indispensable assonance is lost.[7]

Further enquiry by Gunkel and Cheyne made it clear that in Mt 1–2 as well as in Rev. 12 we are dealing with Jewish development of an "international" myth, whose ultimate roots are in Babylonia but which magian astrology spread to all regions of the eastern Mediterranean. The supposed impermeability of the Synagogue to such influences is almost daily shown to be an illusion. As we write comes the news of the excavation from a fifth century synagogue in Beth Alpha, a village of northern Samaria, of a mosaic representing the signs of the zodiac (a favorite subject for Christian churches of the same region and period) with the constellation Virgo given a position of central prominence. The Gothic cathedrals of France show a similar theme, with the Virgin Mother as Queen of Heaven occupying the central position. But the Palestinian synagogues did not take it from Christianity. It is for the historian of Christianity, on the contrary, to learn that the syncretism of the East, which even Judaism could not wholly resist, was indeed, as Eusebius saw, a *Preparatio Evangelica.*

For a summary of the demonstration with full bibliography the reader must look to C. Clemen's *Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des NT.* (1924, pp. 192–202), where the advance of magian astrology from Babylonia through northern Arabia to Syria, with roots extending eastward to Persia and India, and tributary branches from Egypt, an advance well depicted in Cheyne's *Bible Problems* (1904, pp. 65–94), becomes an established fact of comparative religion.

We shall have presently to resume our study of the Hebraistic element of Mt provisionally classed under the designation N, to see whether with Soltau we must identify N with R; or whether the unity of viewpoint and style which undoubtedly characterize this group of passages may be accounted for by a cycle of tradition which indeed comes conspicuously to the surface in Preamble and Epi-

[7] See Appended Note VII, "Matthean Greek and the N Factor." Box calls attention in a footnote at this point to the fact that the targum on Is. 11:1 (the passage probably most in mind) introduces the identification "the Messiah."

logue, but is nevertheless overlapped by and included under the opening accounts of Genealogy and Virgin Birth in the former, just as in the latter it loses itself under the evangelist's "catholicizing" definition of his task.

The question of the unity, or coherence of the N element is a vital one, because the date and environment of the Gospel must largely be determined by this its most distinctive element. Such consideration as is here given to the problem can of course be only preliminary. Full discussion must await consideration of the Hebraizing factor in all its parts, particularly the "apocryphal supplements" to the Epilogue. In our Special Introduction to the Epilogue, accordingly, the question will be taken up of the date of this element and its relation to Mt and to the other sources employed. Meantime we may take account of some of the more substantial traits of N which make upon a number of critics the impression of late oral tradition gathered up by R in various quarters, and having no more of mutual coherence than R himself supplies.

As Streeter well says in arguing for their derivation from some region outside of Palestine (*FG*, p. 502):

> The narratives peculiar to Mt are of quite a different character from those peculiar to Lk. Leaving out of account for the moment the Infancy, the only story peculiar to Matthew which stands, so to speak, "on its own legs" is the Stater in the Fish's Mouth. The rest are all, in a way, parasitic; they stand to Mk as the mistletoe to the oak. The story of Peter walking on the water, for example, is an expansion of the Markan story of Christ walking on the water, and implies the previous existence of the Markan story. Mt's additions to the Passion story are similarly of the nature of embellishments of the Markan account which presuppose Mk as their basis. It is noteworthy that not a single one of them looks like a genuine historical tradition; while some of them are clearly legendary, *e.g.*, the temporary resurrection of saints in Jerusalem at the time of the Rending of the Veil, or Pilate's washing his hands before the multitude—an action as probable in a Roman governor as in a British civil servant in India.

Streeter's judgment on the "haggadic" origin of these attachments to the text does not differ from that of other competent scholars. The question before us is, What sort of unity it is which is not derived from R, and not from any document which "stands upon its own legs," but yet is too great to be accounted for by derivation from any mere cycle of oral tradition.

Romantic dreams of discovering the "authentic Hebrew" of Mt, such as Jerome entertained, must be renounced, as competent scholars in antiquity renounced them when they had opportunity to examine the alleged "authentic Hebrew." Indeed Theodore of Mopsuestia did not hesitate to denounce Jerome's "fifth Gospel" as a fraud.

Study of the Aramaic gospels by Schmidtke and others [8] shows them to be targums of the Greek Gospels of our canon. On the other hand examples such as we have seen in Chapter VI of the liberties which Christian targumists took, after the example of their Jewish predecessors, in the way of "improvements," homiletic interpretations, and edifying supplements to the text, are highly instructive.

N has indeed "Mk as its basis." That would follow from the "Petrine" supplements alone, were it not a matter of course in a region which gives us Synoptic tradition as a whole and in addition the combination called the *Gospel according to Peter* in use at Rhossus down to 195. But had it more, as was certainly the case with *Ev. Ptr.?* That is a question for later chapters. In the meantime we may call attention to the fact that it is not merely the apocryphal supplements of the Epilogue (and the no less apocryphal Petrine supplement of the Stater in the Fish's Mouth) which are linked with the Nativity episodes by traits of thought and locution such as the dream as means of revelation (*cf.* 1:20; 2:12 f., etc., with 27:19). The "Petrine" supplements also have the same relation to rabbinic midrash as the Preamble. For Peter as hero of faith and foundation "Rock" of the new people of God is paralleled, as Schechter has shown (*JQR*, Apr., 1900, p. 428 f.) by the rabbinic interpretation of Is. 51:1 f. given in *Yalkut* i. 766. This also is a parable on the vision of Balaam (Num. 23:9) "from the top of the rocks," and explains why the title, the "Rock," is applied to Abraham:

> There was a king who desired to build and to lay foundations; he dug constantly deeper but found only morass. At last he dug and found a *petra* (a loan word in the Hebrew). He said, On this spot I shall build and lay the foundations. . . . So when God perceived that there would arise an Abraham he said, "Behold I have found the *petra* upon which to build and to lay foundations." Therefore He called Abraham "Rock," as it is said (Is. 51:1 f.), "Look unto the rock whence ye are hewn. Look unto Abraham your father."

It is hopeless, of course, to look for any particular document in which the N legends will be discovered in their pre-Christian form; but it is not hopeless to apply to them the processes which Usener, Gressmann, and Norden have applied to the Epiphany legends of Lk, and Nestle and Box to those of Mt. By comparison of themes and motives we can determine the soil, "a Jewish soil," from which they spring. For if the closer parallels to Lk (and perhaps to Mt 1) lead us toward the Nile, those of Mt 2 lead toward the Euphrates. Both Mt and Lk draw from Jewish-christian sources, sources which in their pre-Christian, oral form are Jewish, but not purely Jewish.

[8] See Appended Note VI.

This Jewish legend-lore in the case of Lk has absorbed elements from Alexandria. In the case of Mt 2 (perhaps of Mt 1 also) it would seem to have come in contact with the legend-lore of Persia and Babylon. Indeed a thousand years later the atmosphere of Mesopotamian Judaism had not lost its distinctive quality if we may trust the description given by the Persian chronographer Al Biruni (*c.* 1000 A.D.) of the "Sabeans" or "Baptizers" of this region, perhaps the same sect of "baptizers" now known as Mandeans, or disciples of John the Baptist, but who call themselves Nazarenes. Al Biruni regards them as a remnant of the Jewish captivity in Babylon who refused to return to Syria, preferring their eastern homes. These, he tells us, "listened to the doctrine of the Magians and inclined toward some of them. So their religion became a mixture of Jewish and Magian elements, like that of the so-called Samaritans, who were transferred from Babylonia to Syria." [9]

But we must return to the question left open in our chapter on the language and style of R^{mt}, whether the peculiar group of scripture quotations extending through all the narrative parts of Mt but specially massed in Mt 2 represent the evangelist himself or only some special source from which he has derived these scripture quotations. Provisionally it was pointed out that in the genealogy and first proof-text R seems to use the LXX, also that in transcribing Mk he seems to assimilate Mk's quotations to the LXX. There are even some signs of unfamiliarity with the Hebrew text which lead Wernle (p. 146) to the positive verdict "Aramaic [10] was an unknown language to the evangelist." Both Hawkins (*HS*, p. 125) and Wernle feel driven to the conclusion that the mixture of scripture quotations, some based on the Hebrew some on the LXX, can be accounted for only by diversity of source. Soltau also, in his careful discrimination of linguistic usage in Mt,[11] agrees to this conclusion, but maintains that the proof-texts from the Hebrew and the legendary supplements are from the hand of the last reviser, whereas the adjustment of Mk to S is the work of a precanonical redactor corresponding to Streeter's M.

Serious objections have been found to Soltau's theory of a narrowly Jewish-christian R; but his evidence for unity between the Preamble (chh. 1–2) and the legendary supplements and proof-texts from the Hebrew is based on linguistic phenomena which should not be overlooked. The Hebraisms, he maintains, are found *exclusively* in the legendary supplements to Mt, not in the Q or Mk

[9] Al Biruni, *Chronography*, Transl. Sachau, Ch. XVIII, p. 314.

[10] The instance on which this verdict is chiefly based (*ὡσαννά*) might seem to indicate rather ignorance of Hebrew.

[11] *ZNW*, I (1900), pp. 219–248.

material. Thus M (if we may apply Streeter's symbol to the corresponding figure in Soltau's theory) seeks always to improve on the Greek of Mk, cancelling Mk's Hebraistic expressions such as *κορβᾶν* in Mk 7:11. But R (the canonical editor of Mt) who inserts the legendary supplement on the suicide of Judas (Mt 27:3–10), speaks of casting the silver-pieces (*ἀργύρια*) "into the treasury" (*εἰς τὸν κορβανᾶν*), when he could equally well have translated; for he has done this in the case of *Aceldama*, which he renders "field of blood" (27:8). Again the New Testament affords no other example of the plural *ἀργύρια* which Soltau will not even allow to be good Greek; for LXX render the "pieces of silver" of Zech. 11:13 *τοὺς ἀργυροῦς*. R^{mt} has *ἀργύρια* not only in the supplement (27:3, 5, 6, 9) and the connected passage 26:15, but in the further supplement of the Bribing of the Watch (28:12, 15). Soltau considers this "a sign of the foreign origin of these passages."

He has in addition a list of eight other expressions peculiar to the supplements and the Preamble which good Greek writers avoid or object to. The list follows:

κατ' ὄναρ: On this expression *cf.* Phot., p. 149, 25 *κατ' ὄναρ οὐ χρὴ λέγειν· βάρβαρόν γε παντελῶς· ἀλλὰ ὄναρ*. Nevertheless we find *κατ' ὄναρ* in Mt 1:20; 2:12, 13, 19, 22 and 27:19, all in supplemental passages.

ὀψὲ δὲ σαββάτων (*τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων*) 28:1 is a highly awkward construction made necessary by the correction of Mk 16:1 f. to a different sense.

μετοικεσία (instead of the better Greek *μετοίκησις*) is found nowhere but in Mt 1:11 f., 17 referring to the Babylonian exile.

δειγματίζω 1:19, a wholly unGreek expression (*cf.* Col. 2:15).

γινώσκω of sexual intercourse, occurs indeed in later Greek not infrequently, but is limited in the New Testament to Mt 1:25, Lk 1:34. It came into use obviously as a reminiscence of LXX (Gen. 4:1, 17; 19:8, etc.).

ἀπὸ τότε, an unGreek form, follows in three instances the supplements instead of the extremely frequent *τότε* elsewhere employed by Mt (Wernle, p. 149).

γεννᾶν (gigno), *γεννᾶσθαι* (gignor, nascor) appears nowhere apart from a transcription of Mk 14:21 = Mt 26:24, except in Mt 1–2 and in the supplement Mt 19:12, although it is a favorite term, *e.g.*, in the vocabulary of Jn, and is also not infrequent in Paul and in Acts.

ἄγγελος τοῦ κυρίου 1:20, 24; 2:13, 19 and again 28:2 = "angel of Yahweh". In Mk always *ἄγγελος* (*μετὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων*), likewise in the Q passages of Mt 13:41; 24:31; 16:27; *μετὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ*. Even in the sole passage, 22:30, where Mt reproduces the Markan *ἄγγελοι ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* (Mk 12.25) by *ὡς ἄγγελοι θεοῦ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ εἰσίν* he avoids the Old Testament expression peculiar to the supplementer (*cf.* Jud. 2:1; Num. 22:22).

οἱ ζητοῦντες τὴν ψυχὴν τοῦ παιδίου Mt 2:20, is an expression not else-

where employed in Mt. It is manifestly framed on the model of the Old Testament.[12]

The rare expression ἐπιβεβηκώς and ὑποζύγιον in Mt 21:4 f. comes from the LXX, whereas πῶλον υἱὸν ὑποζυγίου translates the Hebrew original no less awkwardly than perversely.

On this list of unclassical and mainly Hebraistic expressions Soltau bases two inferences: (1) The series exhibit common linguistic features diverse from the more careful and polished Greek of the original compiler of the Gospel whom Soltau designates Proto-Matthew and Streeter M. Since the Hebraizing passages are scattered throughout Mt they represent another hand to which Soltau would apply the designation Deutero-Matthew. Moreover certain other distinctive characteristics appear to accompany the linguistic, viz., a narrower particularism (*cf.* 23:3; 10:23; 5:18 f.; 10:5 f. with 28:19; 10:14–18) and a dogmatic use of scriptural prediction. In his *Unsere Evangelien. Ihre Quellen und ihr Quellenwerth* (1901), a volume which carries further the argument of his *ZNW* article, Soltau elaborates his distinction between the primary and the secondary redaction of Mt. On p. 81 he sums up his conclusion that "the Logia elements" incorporated by the first evangelist "everywhere repel narrow Judaism, Pharisaism, and reflect the character of undogmatic Christianity." In Proto-Matthew "an undogmatic and likewise universalistic spirit dominates, dogmatic traits and traces of a post-apostolic catholicity (*sic*) are to be found only in the supplements, including the first two chapters." Moreover this broader spirited Proto-Matthew was "widely read and utilized by the Church for one or two decades," so that it could not fail to become known to Lk, and in fact has been employed by him side by side with his own version of S. Deutero-Mt was unknown to Lk.

No small number of critics admit Soltau's first inference. A Hebraistic element actually does subsist in Mt and is principally represented in the Preamble and the supplements. This factor cannot be accounted for from the elements Mk, S, or R as thus far known. But Soltau's further inference distinguishing two redactions, the earlier Hellenistic and the later Judaistic, requires a more careful examination. The linguistic data will be discussed in an Appended Note.[13]

Both of the explanations advanced to account for the N elements of Mt encounter serious objections. Let us designate the explanations *a* and *b*. We may ascribe these elements (*a*) with Soltau, to a second redaction, which prefixed the Preamble and scattered "*Reflections-citate*" and apocryphal supplements throughout that primary form

[12] The reference given (I Kings, 17:21) seems to be a misprint (I Kings, 19:10, 14?). The real parallel should be Ex. 4:19.

[13] See Appended Note VII, "Matthean Greek and the N Factor."

of the Gospel which consisted of a Hellenizing blend of Mk with S. According to Soltau this Proto-Mt circulated in its original form for a full decade, or even two, obtaining "wide acceptance" in the Greek-speaking Church, to the point of influencing Lk, before it was superseded by Deutero-Mt. Our objection is that the Greek-speaking Church would not discard and lose wholly out of remembrance this more universalistic form of the Gospel, characterized by better Greek as well as by greater antiquity and a more liberal type of doctrine, to take up with the Hebraizing substitute. The "post-apostolic catholicity" can incorporate and carry on encysted elements of "narrow Judaism" as Mt 28:19 overshadows 10:5 f., 23. The reverse is not possible.

The alternative explanation (*b*) takes the view that the same R who wove together Mk and S, adding some few sayings and parables from current oral tradition (O), resorted to some late and apocryphal composition of more Hebraizing type than the rest of his material to compose his Preamble and embellish the later narrative with interjected proof-texts and legendary "improvements." The objection will be that outside the material in debate we have no knowledge of Aramaic or Hebrew documents of the type supposed, the material in question giving evidence of Semitic origin, and that doubts have been raised as to whether R^{mt} could use any language but Greek. We know indeed of an Aramaic *Ev. Naz.* in circulation in Aleppo down to the times of Apollinaris of Laodicea and Jerome. But that seems to have been dependent on Mt, not vice versa. *Testimonia*, or collections of proof texts from the Old Testament may quite well have been already in circulation, and some would make these the source of Mt's "*Reflectionscitate.*"

But Soltau and Hawkins both give linguistic evidence to prove that proof-texts and supplements come from the same source. It becomes necessary to fall back on the generalizing statement of Wernle (p. 191):

> The remaining passages (mostly sayings) of Mt's *Sondergut* (P) are derived by him from tradition and legend *with every imaginable degree of working over from complete faithfulness to total transformation.*

The judgment is expressed with special reference to the N material. As we have seen, several critics of various opinion as to the cause are in agreement as to the fact, that one element of the P material of Mt comes from a peculiarly Jewish-christian quarter, where the Hebrew text of the Old Testament was still in use, but where the anti-Jewish feeling apparent in nearly all New Testament writings was exceptionally bitter.

Intense anti-Judaism might at first appear a strange phenomenon

for a community of Jewish blood. In reality it is typical. Even the pagan oppressor is not so bitterly hated by the fanatical Jew as his own kinsman whom he regards as a renegade, or as a betrayer of the national hope. Such to our converted Jew appears the unbelieving majority of his own race. In the language of Mt "the kingdom of God will be taken away from them and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." In still worse light appear the religious leaders to whom is chiefly due the fact that the nation as a whole has turned a deaf ear to the warning of John and the glad tidings of Jesus. In Mt's view they have committed the unpardonable sin of calling the Spirit that spoke and worked through him Beelzebub. Not the true Israel of God, but the "scribes and Pharisees" are guilty in Mt's eyes of having resisted the teaching of the Son of God and with Herodians and Sadducean priesthood plotted his death. If any part of Mt shows its author's animus toward Judaism it is the smaller philippic of 12:30–37 against the Pharisees who had driven Jesus out from his work in Galilee by this blasphemy, together with the greater philippic of seven Woes against Scribes and Pharisees in the closing discourse, where they are held responsible for the fate of Jerusalem. The Woes conclude with the sinister utterance "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of Gehenna?" The phraseology is taken from the Baptist's warning to Israel as a whole, which Mt turns into a special denunciation of "Pharisees and Sadducees" (Mt 23:33; *cf.* 3:7).

Modern critics are of one mind on this salient feature of the Jewish-christian gospel, and indeed it seems not to have escaped the observation of second-century framers of *argumenta*, which told of Mt as author of "five books" against the "God-slaying" people of the Jews.

It is no inconsistency, then, when Wernle (p. 191) brings together the Hebraizing series of proof-texts and the story of the miraculous deliverance of the infant Jesus as sharing in kindred traits of Jewish-christian type:

> For the evangelist the homage of the heathen set over against the Jewish tyrant surely has symbolic meaning. His hand can most surely be distinguished by this anti-Jewish tendency and the method of his proof from prophecy.

Such an Aramaic-speaking Jewish-christian community, clinging to their own language, scripture, and mode of life, yet applauding the mission work of Antioch's leading apostles among the Gentiles, continued to exist at Aleppo down to the end of the fourth century. We have large fragments of their Aramaic gospel (*Ev. Naz.*) a work apparently dependent principally upon our Mt though its supporters

claimed that this relation should be reversed. Nothing can be made of this connection for the origin of canonical Mt save the continuance in this region for centuries of a Jewish-christian body of disciples of a character similar to that which in Mt 4:15 f. applies the prophecy of Is. 8:23–9:1 (Hebr.) to the choosing by Jesus of the shores of Gennesaret as the scene for his first evangelizing activity. Among the Jewish-christians of Aleppo the same Isaian passage, extended to include also verses 2 ff., was thus interpreted:

> When Christ came and the light of his preaching began to dawn the land of Zebulon first and the land of Naphtali were delivered from the errors of the scribes and Pharisees and shook off from their necks the burdensome yoke of Jewish traditions. But afterwards it was increased through the gospel of the Apostle Paul, who was the last of the apostles; that is, the preaching was multiplied and the gospel of Christ blazed forth unto the borders of the Gentiles and the way of the world-sea. Finally the whole world, which before had walked or sat in shadows and been held in the bonds of idolatry and death, beheld the clear light of the gospel.

Comparison with the Hebrew original of this famous messianic prophecy from Is. 8:14 to 9:7 will show how these Nazarene Christians looked upon the gospel message which had come to them as at the same time a confirmation of prophecy, and a deliverance from the yoke of the traditional law imposed by "scribes and Pharisees, who do everything on account of their belly (*cf.* Rom 16:18), and who 'chirp' after the manner of the Magians in their spells." In Is. 8:19 f. the Nazarenes found a direction "to the Law and the Testimony" instead of the "gins and snares" spread by the Synagogue teachers whom they had once revered as "kings and gods." In Is. 29:9–24 they found not only the passage quoted in Mk 7:6 f. (=Is. 29:13) but explicit prophecy against the authors of the Mishnah (δευτέρωσις) and an allusion to their "using the word of God to cause men to sin, so as to deny that Christ was the Son of God" (29:21).

It is to Jerome's borrowings from his better informed predecessor among these Nazarene Christians of Aleppo, Apollinaris of Laodicea, borrowings (often unacknowledged) made for his *Commentary on Isaiah* (Migne, *Lat. Patr.* 24, 122 f., 126, 128, 348, 369 f.), that we owe such insight as can be gained into Nazarene Christianity as it was at the close of the fourth century. It occupied the standpoint of our Book of Acts on the question of Gentile freedom from the Law, rejoicing in Paul's conquest of the Gentile world. But as respects its own practice it clung with utmost fidelity to "the law and the testimony" only giving it a higher and better interpretation than the "righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees." The precepts, the "second law" (*mishnah*) of the scribes and Pharisees was a plant which the

heavenly Father had not planted, and which must be rooted up. Nor did the Nazarenes leave room to doubt who, in their interpretation, were meant by the "two houses of Israel," to whom the Redeemer should be "a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence" (Is. 8:14). These were "Shammai and Hillel, from whom are derived the scribes and Pharisees, to whom succeeded Johanan ben Zacchai, and after him Eliezer."

Whether this bitter hatred of the Judaism of "scribes and Pharisees" was altogether a Christian growth developed since their conversion, or whether like some other sectarians of later Judaism at Damascus and in Transjordan, the Nazarenes of Aleppo offered fruitful soil to the sowing of the first evangelists just because of certain previous tendencies to rebellion against the growing weight of the "Second law" we need not here enquire. Neither is it vital to our understanding of the Jewish-christian Gospel of Mt to decide the debated question of the critics whether its undeniable infusion of Hebraistic material is drawn from some Nazarene targum of a Petrine gospel on which R has relied for his Hebraizing proof-texts and midrashic supplements, or whether they must be regarded as gathered at random among Christians of Jewish race in northern Syria. The important point is to know that such contacts are present, that our canonical Mt in its P material has experienced touches from this North Syrian world, a world of Judaism not wholly of the Palestinian type, and influenced already before the birth of Christianity by the religious rites and traditions of Babylonia and the Magianism which succeeded.

One other link remains connecting the factor N with the Nazarenes of northern Arabia. Epiphanius, a resident for many years of Syria, is explicit in distinguishing the Nazarene Christians of Aleppo, his contemporaries, from a pre-Christian sect of Nassoreans (Ναασαραίοι), who would seem to correspond to the Nussairi of the mountain region between Antioch and Apamea of today.[14] The spelling of the name differs as respects the second consonant, but Pliny, who is very accurate in his geographical data for this region, probably deriving them from official reports of Agrippa, also uses the z (Nazareni). He thus amply confirms the statement of Epiphanius as regards the pre-Christian origin of the Nussairi, at the same time introducing the same confusion of names which we find in the New Testament between Nazarenes (Ναζαρηνόι) and Nazoreans (Ναζωραῖοι). The former is uniform with Mk and seems to be understood to mean "native of Nazareth." In Lk it occurs but once, viz., Lk 4:34, which transcribes unchanged Mk 1:24. Elsewhere in Lk-Acts we have uniformly "Nazorean," as also in Mt and Jn. In Acts

[14] *Panar.* 29:6, 1.

24:5 the "Nazoreans" are referred to as a "sect" (αἵρεσις). But it is highly improbable that a sect should take its name from a village, least of all the believers in the Galilean Messiah, since notoriously his fellow-townsmen at Nazareth had *dis*believed. Had the Christians received their designation from the reputed birthplace of their Master they would have become known as "Bethlehemites," or from the region whence his disciples were recruited "Galileans." The connection of the term "Nazarene" (Ναζωραῖος) in Mt 2:23 with the village of Nazareth is therefore probably a mistake due to Mk's use of the designation Ναζαρηνός *as if* it meant "native of Nazareth." Perhaps this Ναζαρηνός should be counted as one more of the "Latinisms" for which Mk is noted. At all events we must look to Mk as the source of the mistaken derivation of Nazoreans from Nazareth, and regard the attempt of R^{mt} to explain how Jesus, though born in Bethlehem was "called a Nazorean," as resting upon this Markan false etymology.

But if we further ask whence he derived his Scripture proof, which seems to be based upon the Hebrew text of Is. 11:1 and involves some manipulation of the stem *netser* "shoot" or "scion" the answer can only be that it is a borrowed proof-text which the evangelist himself probably is no better able to locate than one which he mistakenly ascribes to "Isaiah" in 13:35 and another which he ascribes to "Jeremiah" in 27:9. Whether those who first employed it were predecessors of the Nazoreans, the universalistic Jewish-christians of Aleppo of Jerome's time, or the still earlier Nasareans whom Epiphanius declares to have been a "pre-Christian sect" akin to the Essenes, and Pliny locates "across the river (Marsyas) from Apamea" is a question for the philologians to determine. Either way the general region whence our first canonical Gospel, the Greek compilation now entitled "According to Matthew," has received its infusion of Jewish-christian coloration, remains the same. It is the region of northern Arabia between Antioch and the Euphrates, the region where Christianity first found national acceptance, of whose chief city our leading authority on Syriac literature (Burkitt, *GHTr*, p. 172) has written:

> We cannot doubt that many of the survivors of the catastrophe (of the year 70 A.D.) lost their nationality and became merged with the Gentiles. Very likely many became Christians: it is difficult, for instance, to explain certain features in the rise of Christianity in Edessa, except on the supposition that the original congregation was largely composed of converted Jews.

CHAPTER XII

THE FIRST BOOK OF MT

In the carrying out of a purpose such as that of our first evangelist it is natural that the first of the five great Discourses should be devoted to the theme of Jesus' teaching regarding Righteousness,[1] and that the narrative framework leading up to it, after the plan followed throughout the Gospel, should place this Discourse at the first available point in the story of Mk. In point of fact Division A of Book I gives a striking example of that abbreviation of narrative, that rearrangement and epitomizing of Markan material in the interest of better presentation of the Discourse, which have been shown to be salient features of Mt's method.

Both Lk and Mt place the discourse at substantially the same point in Mk's story, the gathering of the "great multitude from Galilee" at the lake-shore, after Jesus' proclamation of the coming Kingdom in the synagogues has roused the opposition of the scribes and Pharisees (Mk 3:7–12). It is impossible, in spite of the suggestion that Mt "might have inserted the Discourse at Mk's first mention of Jesus' preaching at Mk 1:21 or 39," to place it anywhere else than after Mk 3:7–12, if any regard be had for the implications of the discourse itself. For it is addressed to a body of Come-outers, with "the disciples" as nucleus of the "multitude." To these, therefore, Jesus must now explain his program.

This program, so far, merely takes up the unfinished work of John. Jesus has made his general proclamation that "the kingdom of God is at hand," that a preparation for it is needful by "repentance," and that this announcement is to be received in "faith" as "glad tidings." It is now imperative that he should explain what he means by these terms. If a new Israel is to be formed "prepared for the Coming" by repentance and faith Jesus must make this "unchurched" rabble understand why the Synagogue does not meet the need. If the Baptist's prophetic message is to be made effective he must show that there is a righteousness of sons who are such not as "Abraham's children," nor as obedient servitors of the precepts of the scribes, but as imitators of their Father's goodness of heart, an ethic of the ancient prophets, "What doth Jehovah require of thee

[1] On Mt's use of δικαιοσύνη = "justification" or "approbation in God's sight" see above, p. 133 f. and Appended Note X.

but to do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God?" Jesus has been offering a "gospel" to be accepted with "faith." He must show now its foundation. The situation implied is, therefore, substantially that which Mk 1:1–3:12 describes; but there are Markan omissions on the one side and additions on the other which it is important to note both for the better understanding of the relation of Mk to S and for that of the discourse itself. These have been set forth in my *BGS* with reasons for the decision, so that here a brief summary will suffice.

1. The implied outline is developed in Mk by certain illustrative and explanatory *additions*. The section Mk 3:13–35, which so awkwardly intervenes between the setting for the discourse in 3:7–12 and its delivery in 4:1 ff., is intended to explain more fully the term "disciples," which Mk understands in the limited sense of the Twelve. The selection of these is therefore related in a curious digression which takes Jesus and these Twelve "up into the mountain" while the assembled multitude patiently wait below for the reappearance of the Speaker. This infelicity occasions the difference between the two reports of Mt and Lk. Mt makes the multitude ascend the mountain after Jesus and the Twelve, Lk makes Jesus and the Twelve come down to the plain, where the multitude assemble without notice or special occasion. Mk's list of the Twelve is therefore interjected. Its alien origin is apparent from the fact that it does not mention Levi son of Alphaeus, though the call of Levi in 2:13 f. is one of the reasons why Jesus' work in the synagogues roused the opposition of its leaders, and thus led to the "withdrawal."

But further, Mk 3:20–35 is a digression within a digression. For the sake of the logion declaring the disciples to be Jesus' true kindred (Mk 3:31–35=Lk 8:19–21=S (Lk 11:27 f.)) Mk introduces after the list of the Twelve another multitude and another occasion, so that he never returns at all to the discourse which should have explained the terms of the proclamation of the kingdom, but goes on with the discourse on True Adepts of the Divine Mysteries. The case is paralleled by Mk's digression at 6:17, from which again he never returns. The confusion occasioned by this mode of narration (*e.g.*, in Mt 14:12) is quite enough to account for the verdict of ancient tradition against Mk's "order." On the other hand we shall see under the head of "omissions" that for the readers our Roman evangelist addresses he could well afford to pass over as teaching belonging to the church catechist rather than the apostle, a discourse on the Righteousness of Sons which to the post-apostolic neo-legalist seemed indispensable, and which to the modern embodies the very essence of Jesus' message. We must credit Mk with a real intention to reproduce the missionary preaching of Peter.

We must also count among the additions of Mk to the primitive outline much of the narrative interjected between the general statement of 1:39 that Jesus "went into their synagogues throughout all Galilee, preaching and casting out demons" (*cf.* Acts 10:37 f.) and the assembling of the "great multitude from all Galilee" (3:7). Mk presents here a series of disconnected instances of the growing opposition of the scribes and Pharisees to Jesus' work, culminating in 3:6 with the conspiracy of the Pharisees and Herodians against his life. Some of this material, like the logion on Spiritual Kin and its context, he draws, it is true, from S, as shown in my *BGS*. But Mk has largely supplemented this nucleus, just as he has visibly supplemented the description of the multitude in 3:7b–12. Mk's anti-Judaism leads him to expand whatever basic statement he found in S concerning this opposition into a full section, which at the close passes quite beyond the mark, anticipating the collision which led to Jesus' departure from Galilee (*cf.* 8:15 and Lk 13:31 f.). On the other hand enough fragments remain to bear out the implication of the discourse itself that in S also there was something to account for the coming forth of the multitude of Jesus' followers from the Synagogue.

2. It has been shown in my *BGS* (pp. 9 ff.) that Mk makes a certain use of S. We must therefore account for his neglect to use more by his design, which we are credibly informed was to record the apostolic witness of Peter. It may be surmised that catechetic teaching was not considered to belong in the witness of an apostle. We must therefore expect also certain *omissions* of Mk. For it is implied in Mk's own narrative that he has passed over certain elements of the story which Q supplies. Thus the preaching of repentance in view of the coming Kingdom (Mk 1:14 f.) is certainly a continuation of the message of the imprisoned prophet as described in Q (Mt 3:7–12 = Lk 3:7–17). *But Mk omits to state that John had any such message.* His nearest approach to it is his distinction of the baptism of John from Christian baptism of the Spirit by designating it "the baptism of repentance unto forgiveness of sins." John for Mk is merely the Elias who "prepares the way of the Lord" by anointing the Christ. An instance much more familiar is the omission of everything from the Temptation story of Q (Mt 4:1–11 = Lk 4:1–13) save the bare statement that "He was in the wilderness forty days tempted of Satan; and he was with the wild beasts; and the angels ministered unto him" (Mk 1:13).

If, then, Mk has left it to the catechist to explain what was meant by "the baptism of repentance unto forgiveness of sins" we should find it less difficult to understand how he could leave it to the same agency to explain what was embodied in that teaching which was

committed to the Twelve as "the mystery of the kingdom of God." The title "Reminiscences of (the Missionary Preaching of) Peter" at least represents what the post-apostolic Church understood to be the contents of Mk. If it really represents the evangelist's design we can understand his omission of much material of the type of the Sermon. At all events it is equally certain that Mk knew these elementary truths of church teaching, and that he, like Paul, did not regard them as constituting the message of the "apostle," who is primarily a witness of the manifestation of the Son of God. Of course the apostle too must teach his converts what sort of conduct admits to the inheritance (Gal. 5:21). And the question "What must I do to inherit eternal life? is indeed answered by Mk, though in another sense than Mt's, in his section on Law vs. Grace (Mk 10:13–45).

We may therefore hold, in spite of Mk's additions and digressions, that Mt and Lk are correct in taking the description of the assembled multitude "from Galilee," who have "withdrawn" with Jesus and his disciples from the Synagogue (Mk 3:7) as the proper situation for the discourse on Filial Righteousness. The situation accounts for its opening Beatitudes, whose paradoxes aim at differentiation. The heirs of the Kingdom are—not those, but these. In Mt they segregate the disciple of the Kingdom from the disciple of the Synagogue. They explain how his "righteousness" differs from that of the scribes and Pharisees. Mt's standard is "the Law and the prophets" (7:12) plus the new commandment (19:18 f.). In Lk the Beatitudes (offset by Woes), segregate the same disciple from the world. He has believed the "glad tidings" and henceforth lives in the world as not of it. In the brotherhood to which he now belongs the world's distinctions of rich and poor, socially exalted and socially despised, are superseded. Mt proclaims a new *Law* which separates its observers from the Synagogue, Lk a new *gospel* which separates believers from the world. It is not difficult to see which conception stands nearer to the proclamation of the glad tidings by the Prophet of Galilee. Both agree in bringing the opening words of the Discourse into the key of Lk 4:16 ff. where Jesus takes Is. 61:1 f. as text for his glad tidings to "the poor."

Once the relation of Mk to the Q material is realized it becomes easier to see the significance of the situation (on which Mt and Lk agree) as determining the nature and bearing of the discourse. In consequence of the hostility with which Jesus' message has been received at the hands of the synagogue authorities, he and his disciples and following have "withdrawn" (ἀνεχώρησεν) to the lake-shore. It is now imperative for him to give coherence to this unorganized body. He must give them principles of action to take the place of those which his preaching has assumed to be inadequate. He has heralded

throughout Galilee the message, a message "from heaven and not of men," of the imprisoned prophet. How now to make "a people prepared for the Coming"? What of the required "repentance"? What of the "belief in the glad tidings"? We shall see presently that the Q discourse does respond in all its parts to this historical situation. Some description of it, however brief, must have been given in S, for no other supposition will account both for the intrinsic requirement of the discourse and for the differences among our three reporters of the beginnings of the Galilean ministry.

Division A

We have already seen that Mk, who previously had ignored all that related to the prophetic message of John and his effort to "make ready for Jehovah a people prepared for him," might leave it to the church catechist to explain the moral implications of this preparation by repentance and faith, and pass on at once to the discourse on True Hearers (Mk 4:9, 23); because Mk's interest and that of his Roman readers is centered on the differentiation of the group of Spiritual Kin to whom is given the "mystery of the kingdom of God." Mk's objective is, in fact, the hiding of this mystery through the parabolic method of teaching from the "outsiders," Jesus' kindred according to the flesh, who "have ears to hear" but hear not. We have now to see how Mt has blended S and Mk in order to secure from the combination the pragmatic values which to him were most essential. The purpose in view appears quite distinctly in the Narrative Introduction (Division A) which leads up to the Discourse (Division B).

The most conspicuous feature in Mt's use of Mk 1:1–3:12 is the shortening of the story element. All that pertains to the story of the ministry of preaching in the synagogues of Galilee is summed up in a single verse in the stereotyped formula of 4:23 (*cf.* 9:35):

> And Jesus went about in all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of disease and all manner of sickness among the people.[2]

Everything not indispensable to the scene-setting for the Discourse Mt either postpones or omits altogether. Of course the Vocation at the Baptism of John and Beginning of the Preaching in Galilee (3:1–4:17 = Mk 1:1–15) could not be omitted, nor the Calling of the Fishermen (4:18–22 = Mk 1:16–20). They were implied in the group of "disciples" addressed. But all of Mk's story that follows the first mention of Jesus' preaching in the synagogue (Mk 1:21 f.) is postponed by Mt to form part of the narrative introducing his second

[2] How much of this summary of R^m rests on S cannot, of course, be determined. Something similar must have paved the way for the discourse.

Discourse, or else omitted altogether. Even the Sabbath of Miracles at Capernaum is displaced.[3] The first of the series, the Exorcism in the Synagogue (Mk 1:21–28), is omitted entirely,[4] as well as the Reaction and Departure (35–38). Mt reserves the rest of the Markan story for the group of Mighty Works forming Division A of Book II. Not even the Call of Levi ("Matthew") nor the Choosing of the Twelve are thought necessary. The Call of Levi is postponed to II, A; the Choosing of the Twelve is omitted altogether, though the list is given in II, A. A clean sweep is made of the entire section on Opposition of the scribes and Pharisees (Mk 1:40–3:6), part of it postponed to II, A, part to III, A. This brings Mk's opening scene of the section (Jesus' Preaching in the Synagogue, Mk 1:21 f.) into juxtaposition with the last. Having omitted the Sabbath of Miracles of Mk 1:21–39, and the section on Growing Opposition which follows in 1:40–3:6, all that Mt now requires to make a suitable *mise en scène* for the Discourse is to summarize in 4:23–25 the omitted material, including in the summary Mk's description of the assembled multitude. He can now bracket the Discourse between the description of the audience (Mk 3:7–12) and Mk 1:22, which described the effect of Jesus' preaching. The latter passage is combined with S to form the first "transition formula":

Mk 1:22	Mt 7:28 f.
And they were astonished at his teaching; for he taught them as one having authority and not as the scribes.	And it came to pass when Jesus had finished these words that the multitudes were astonished at his teaching; for he taught them as one having authority and not as their scribes.

Only less conspicuous than Mt's radical shortening of the narrative portions of Mk employed in his introduction to the first Discourse is his expansion of the teaching element. This appears even in his introduction. Mk had omitted from S everything concerned with the Baptist's Proclamation of the coming Kingdom. Mt now restores this in 3:7–12, as well as the Temptations, which interpret the sense in which Jesus takes the divine Vocation. These also had been omitted by Mk, but are restored by Mt in 4:1–11. Lk makes the same restorations, which would certainly commend themselves to any evangelist aiming to make good Mk's notorious deficiency. Such other material as Mt may have woven in from S in Division A either consists of

[3] Mt 8:16 "when even was come" betrays the displacement by omitting the fact that this was the Sabbath (Mk 1:21).

[4] For the reason see my article, "The Markan Theory of Demonic Recognition of the Christ" in *ZNW*, VI (1905), pp. 153–158.

very minute touches or escapes our identification because not seconded by Lk. He does take occasion, however, because of his anti-Jewish apologetic, to attach two supplements of P material. The fact that Jesus had submitted to be baptized by John was held up as a mark of inferiority. R attaches, accordingly, to Mk's statement of the fact (Mk 1:9=Mt 3:13) the following answer to the objection in 3:14 f.:

> But John would have hindered him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? But Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness. Then he suffereth him.

Even without the telltale phrase "fulfil all righteousness" it would be easy to determine responsibility for this apologetic supplement, which *Ev. Hebr.* repeats with slight "improvements." [5] It is quoted by Ignatius, who thus guarantees its originality with Mt, but in standpoint and motive it recalls the apologetic of *Ev. Naz.*, which meets the objection that Jesus had submitted to a "baptism of repentance unto forgiveness of sin" as follows:

> Behold, the mother of the Lord and his brethren said to him: John the Baptist is baptizing for the forgiveness of sins; let us go and be baptized by him. But he said to them, What sin have I committed that I should go and be baptized by him? Unless indeed this very word that I have spoken be a sin of ignorance.

Both supplements attach to the same passage of Mk [6] and display precisely the same style of targumic interpretative and apologetic rendering. *Ev. Naz.* had already given us an example of the same type in its version of the Rich Enquirer.[7]

Another addition in 4:13–16 exhibits the same apologetic interest, but is probably not original with R, for it belongs with the group of "reflective" quotations whose Hebrew base is hardly concealed by a partial assimilation to the LXX. It is probably from an Aramaic targum of the same type as *Ev. Naz.* that R derives his scriptural defense against the objection that if Jesus had a message for Israel it should have been delivered at once in Jerusalem instead of in provincial Galilee. (The fourth Gospel rearranges the story so as to

[5] See Appended Note VI, p. 478.

[6] It is important to observe that the basis of the apologetic supplement of *Ev. Naz.* in this case is not Mt but *Mk* 1:4. Mt avoids the objectionable clause "unto forgiveness of sins" (Mk 1:4=Lk 3:3) by transferring it to 26:28 ("my blood shed for forgiveness of sins"; *cf.* Jn 1:29). Thus Mt and *Ev. Naz.* stand to one another here in a relation of parallelism, not of dependence. We do not suggest that Mt 3:14 f. is derived from *Ev. Naz.*, but that its author (R) breathes the same atmosphere.

[7] Above, p. 89.

make this the actual course followed by Jesus.) After the statement of Mk 1:14 that Jesus "came into Galilee" to begin his work after John's imprisonment Mt interjects a quotation from Is. 8:23; 9:1 (Engl. 9:1 f.), where "Galilee of the Gentiles" is spoken of as the region of deepest gloom, where the dawn of deliverance is first to shine. The passage is the same which the Nazarenes of Apollinaris' time appealed to, first to excuse their rejection of the scribes and synagogue leaders, whom they had once looked up to as "kings and gods," second to justify the Gentile missions of Paul. Because of these affinities we have felt it proper to place the symbol N opposite these two supplements in our translation.[8]

Division B

Having constructed thus by addition and subtraction from Mk 1:1–3:12 a suitable narrative introduction, Mt forms by agglutination of teachings of Jesus, all derived from non-Markan sources, his first great Discourse in 5:1–7:27. To appreciate the general structure of this B division we shall find of service the following table of source material, which divides it into (1) Q material *in situ* (*i.e.*, paralleled by Lk in the same discourse); (2) Q material from other discourses; (3) individual P logia; (4) P discourse. The table is given by McNeile (*Comm.*, p. 99 f.).

(§ 1) Discourse common to Mt and Lk—

	Mt	Lk		Mt	Lk
(a)	5: 3	6:20	(c)	7: 1, 2	6:37, 38b
	4, 6 [9]	21b, 21a		3–5	41, 42
	5, 7–10	——		12 [9]	31
	11, 12	22, 23	(d)	16–20	43, 44
(b)	38–42	29, 30		21	46
	43–48 [9]	27, 28, 32–36		24–27	47–49

(§ 2) Scattered passages collected by Mt—

5:13	14:34 f. (Mk 9:50)	6:19–21	12:33 f.
15	11:33 (8:16; Mk 4: 21)	22, 23	11:34–36
		24	16:13
18, 19	16:17	25–33	12:22–31
25, 26	12:58, 59	7:7–11	11:9–13
32	16:18	13, 14	13:24
6: 9–13	11:2–4	22, 23	13:26, 27

(§ 3) Passages peculiar to Mt—

5:14, 16, 23, 24, 31; 6:7, 8, 14, 15; 7:6, 15.

[8] See above, p. 162 and Part III.

[9] Change of order.

(§ 4) Discourse peculiar to Mt—

Thesis: 5:17 (18 f.), 20

(a) The Righteousness of the Scribes, 5:21–37, 38–48: Murder (verses 21, 22), Adultery (verses 17–30), False oaths (verses 33–37).

(b) The Righteousness of the Pharisees, 6:1–6, 16–18: The general Principle (verse 1), Alms (verses 2–4), Prayer (verses 5, 6), Fasting (verses 16–18).

The table should be corrected by the transfer of 5:19 (P^{mt}) to § 3 and the addition to the same section of 5:7–10 and 6:34. It should be compared with the important comment which follows it, of which, however, we have space here only for the closing paragraph, which brings clearly before us the issue thus far left in abeyance (though several times referred to), viz., Streeter's theory of a Proto-Matthew, the supposed document M intervening between S and Mt, corresponding to the document L which many critics think it necessary to postulate between S and Lk. McNeile writes as follows (p. 101):

> While it is clear that Mt and Lk employed different recensions of Q, the history of which cannot be traced, the most serious difficulty would be removed if we could suppose that the discourse on the Law (§ 4) was originally circulated as an independent document. Mt may have found it so, or it may already have been attached at some point (not necessarily in the Sermon) to the recension of Q which he used. Finding the sayings on Retaliation, and on Love and Hatred, arranged in the form in which Lk has them, he altered the order, adding verses 38 and 43, and ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, thus making them similar to the preceding sayings in his discourse. Derivation from an independent source would also account for the Greek form Ἱεροσόλυμα (5:35) in an utterance of Jesus (see on 23:37). Lastly the command "Judge not" (7:1) affords no sequence with the preceding verses, but is closely connected with 5:44–48 (Love excludes censorious judgment); and in Lk the parallels to 5:48 and 7:1 are placed together; Mt 6, therefore, was interpolated by Mt, and not omitted by Lk or his source, for polemical or other reasons.

Our Appended Note VIII and translation (Pt. III) will indicate the measure of agreement we are able to reach with such competent scholars as Marriott and McNeile in the source analysis of the Sermon as respects both sections of the Q material, those *in situ* and those transferred, the reasons having been stated in *SM*. On the question of M only a study of the P material can decide, particularly a study of § 3 containing the short comments or floating logia, whether of rabbinic or Christian tradition, where the hand of R can be most reliably identified. We have already noted the necessity of adding to this list of P^{mt} passages the verses 5:19 and 6:34, which McNeile has omitted (perhaps by oversight) and 5:7–10 a passage only shown as belonging to this P material by the —— in the parallel column. When

full account is taken of the elements most surely attributable to R a sounder conclusion can be reached as to the degree of alteration and supplementation for which he individually can be held responsible. It will be recalled that our study thus far tends to the conclusion that R's function was far less mechanical, less limited to mere transcription of documents, than critics have been disposed to think.

Of the (corrected) list of "Passages peculiar to Mt" under § 3 several have already been referred to R. Thus 6:7 f. and 14 f. have the distinctive notes of influence from Ecclesiasticus and special emphasis on the necessity of forgiveness of brethren (*cf.* 18:21–35). The latter characteristic is no less prominent in 5:23 f., which may therefore safely be ascribed to the same hand. The last two verses are not of R's composition, but reflect the type of thought characteristic of Ecclesiasticus and of Johanan ben Zacchai. The fact that sacrifice is referred to as still practicable is no obstacle to regarding the saying as *taken up* from oral tradition, whether in Church or Synagogue, after the overthrow of the temple. The same interest is apparent in two of the Beatitudes of P^{mt}. Mt 5:7 epitomizes 18:21–35 and 5:9 is closely akin. It has a remarkable parallel in rabbinic teaching [10] which comments on the name "Shulamite" (interpreted as "Peacemaker") for Israel as Jehovah's bride in Cant. 6:13 (Heb. 7:1) and the four-fold entreaty "Return" (or "Repent"). In combination with Is. 66:12 and 1:26 f. it is taught that God thus entreats his people to be reconciled to Him in order that they may "make peace for the world." For the alienated and unrepentant world the people of God are charged with what Paul designates "the message of the reconciliation." We may see the same poetic thought in Jas. 3:18, but it is not fair to the finest spirits of rabbinic Judaism to deny its independent origin in the Synagogue.

The other two Matthean Beatitudes which fail to appear in the Lukan form are both from the Psalms. Mt 5:5 reproduces Ps. 37:11 (LXX), while Mt 5:8 epitomizes Ps. 24:4 (LXX). It is difficult to see thus far any occasion for assuming "another recension of Q" from which R might derive his supplements; for while in form Mt 5:10 is assimilated to the seven preceding "beatitudes," in substance it merely epitomizes the two Q verses which follow. A tell-tale verbal trait is Mt's favorite term δικαιοσύνη.

The liturgical form aimed at in the Matthean Beatitudes appears to be a decalogue, of which the tenth "word" is verse 12 = Lk 6:23. This being in the second person and forming part of the preceding congratulation (verse 11 = Lk 6:22) eight Beatitudes were required

[10] See *Genesis Rabba*, 66:2, and *cf.* my article, "The Blessing of the Peacemakers" in *Expository Times* for Nov., 1929 (XLI, No. 2). See Appended Note X.

before it. This total is accordingly made up by the insertion of verse 4 (in the oldest texts after verse 5) and the addition of verses 7–9. All four supplements seem to bear the hall-mark of R. Lk's Beatitudes on the other hand form a pentad consisting of four felicitations followed by the exhortation to "Rejoice" (verse 23). To this pentad are appended, perhaps by a later hand (L?), *four* Woes.

In the list of P^{mt} passages we have further two verses of the highly composite Exordium (5:13–16) prefixed to the Theme. One of these (5:16) forms its "Editorial Conclusion" [11] and is so saturated with both the ideas and phraseology of R as to leave no doubt of its origin:

> Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works and may glorify your Father who is in heaven.

The other (verse 14) consists of two logia. The first, "Ye are the light of the world," is one of the commonplaces of rabbinic teaching closely paralleled in the *Testament of Levi*, 14:3, where the priestly tribe are told "Ye are the lights of Israel." The other logion survives in uncanonical tradition [12] as a saying of Jesus. It also is a mere current proverb "A city situated on a mountain cannot be hid." If to these two verses of the Exordium we add 7:6 ("Give not holy flesh to the dogs"), and 6:34 ("Sufficient unto the day is its evil"), two popular maxims of similar type, there will remain of the "passages (*sc.* 'logia') peculiar to Mt" only two, both of which are so typical of R's dominant interest that we need but quote them in full. In 5:19 our evangelist expresses his view of the relative value to the Church of the teacher who "looses" (*i.e.*, shows a requirement of the Law to be obsolete) as compared with the teacher who "binds" (*i.e.*, shows a requirement to be obligatory):

> Whosoever therefore shall loose one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, he shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.

In 7:15 Mt adds to this blessing pronounced on the conservative "scribe converted to the kingdom of heaven" a warning against the teachers of "lawlessness" even when (as in Mk 9:39 and Acts 19:13 ff.) they do mighty works in the name of Jesus:

> Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are ravening wolves.

[11] *Synopticon* of A. Wright, p. 192.
[12] Oxyrhynchus Fragment, Log. VI.

Thus the simple process of grouping together the "passages peculiar to Mt" already furnishes a picture of R's character and viewpoint.

The "discourses peculiar to Mt" (§ 4, *a* and *b*) have also their story to tell. It is in fact around this P^{mt} group that discussion revolves. According to McNeile it "consists of a complete and coherent discourse" on the theme of the relation of the moral characteristics Jesus desires to see in his followers to the laws and customs of his nation. We may therefore call it appropriately: The New Torah section.

Against the view of Harnack, which denies this P material a place in Q on the ground that it partakes of "that controversial attitude toward Judaism which is a peculiar characteristic of St. Matthew" (*Btr* II, p. 183, Engl.), McNeile protests:

> That it was the work of Mt, or of any other early Christian, is utterly improbable. The moral insight which could penetrate to the spiritual "fulfilment" of the Mosaic laws is that of the Lord Himself and of none other.

We have seen above (p. 123 f.) strong reason for inclusion at least of its former part in S.

It remains, then, to account for the non-appearance of this New Torah section in Lk. Here McNeile inclines to the explanation of Stanton (*GHD* II, pp. 80–84), who resorts to an L theory, at least so far as this particular discourse is concerned. According to Stanton the Aramaic original of the discourse on Filial Righteousness appeared in two Greek translations, one intended for Jews, the other for Gentiles; and the translator of the latter omitted all that he deemed unsuitable for Gentiles. As compensation for the omission of the condemnations of hypocrisy in alms, prayer, and fasting L added the Woes (Lk 6:24 ff.), which form a sort of generalization of the condemnation. (*Cf.* Lk's ἀπέχετε τὴν παράκλησιν ὑμῶν with Mt's ἀπέχουσιν τὸν μισθὸν αὐτῶν). The extent of McNeile's agreement with Stanton can be judged from the extract already given.[13]

Lukan divergence from the original form of S has already been exemplified. In the case of the parable of the Slighted Invitation[14] we have seen how editorial alteration takes place on both sides. With or without L as an intermediate link our third evangelist does present, at this point at least, a form of S better adapted to Gentile readers. It stands closer, moreover, to the parallels in Jas. If L be such an intermediate document we must also assign to it much of the narrative element by which S is expanded in Lk's employment into a

[13] Above, p. 172.

[14] Above, p. 65.

true "narrative" (διήγησις).[15] We have, therefore on the Lukan side, plenty of analogy for Stanton's theory of a form of S in which the Woes (Lk 6:24–26) compensate for the omission of much "anti-Pharisaic" material.

On the other hand Harnack's ground for excluding the New Torah from S is only valid on the supposition that S showed nothing like the anti-Judaism of R^{mt}. Now it is quite true that elaboration and expansion of anti-Judaistic material is one of the most distinctive notes of R^{mt}. One of the few points of agreement between Zahn and Harnack is that both these leading scholars make it beyond all else *the* distinctive characteristic of Mt, and in this, as we have seen, they appear to be following the judgment of antiquity.[16] Such a tendency might account for *supplementation* by R^{mt} of anti-Pharisaic material found in S; hardly more. From our analysis of division *b* of the New Torah, however, in which critics agree in finding *three* elements, both R material and Q material being superimposed on a basis which displays a triadic symmetry, we have reason to expect the same elements in division *a*, where a similar literary symmetry has been similarly dislocated. R's part is superficial.

No less convincing is the argument from content. The favorable judgment of *OS* has already been recorded.[17] We can but concur with McNeile, who declares it "utterly improbable" that any other than "our Lord Himself" should display "the moral insight which could penetrate to this spiritual fulfilment of the Mosaic laws"; for surely it would be hard to maintain the proposition that S did not contain anti-Pharisaic material, or utterances derogatory to outward legalism if the Lukan parables of the Good Samaritan and the Pharisee and Publican may be taken as representative either of Jesus' actual teaching or of Lk's conception of it.

Two things, however, remain to be accounted for: (1) The literary symmetry of the entire section, including both (a) and (b); (2) the "interpolation of Mt 6" by R^{mt} at a point where it interrupts the connection preserved by Lk between 5:48 and 7:1. In order to make apparent this literary symmetry and at the same time exhibit the double divergence between Mt and Lk it will be advisable to place the two witnesses to S in parallel columns, omitting from Mt the elements ascribed, or to be ascribed, to editorial supplementation, but retaining between — — those of R^{lk}: [18]

[15] "Ye have received your consolation" (παράκλησιν) in 6:24 recalls the description of the aged Simeon in 2:25, who was "awaiting the consolation (παράκλησιν) of Israel."

[16] See above, p. xiv.

[17] Above, p. 123.

[18] See further Appended Note VIII, "The Four-document Hypothesis and Mt 5–6."

Mt

Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment: but I say unto you, that everyone who is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the Gehenna of fire.

Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt not commit adultery: but I say unto you, that everyone that looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.

Again, ye have heard that it was said to them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths: but I say unto you, Swear not at all, but let your speech be Yea, yea; Nay, nay: and whatsoever is more than these is of evil.

Ye have heard that it was said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth; but I say unto you, Resist not him that is evil: but whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man would go to law with thee, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also. And whosoever shall impress thee to go one mile, go with him two. Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away.

Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy: but I say unto you, Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you, that ye may be sons of your Father who is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust. For if ye love them that love you, what claim to reward have ye? Do not even the publicans the same? And if ye salute your brethren only,

Lk (L)

—But woe unto you that are rich! for ye have received your consolation. Woe unto you, ye that are full now! for ye shall hunger. Woe unto you, ye that laugh now! for ye shall mourn and weep. Woe unto you when all men shall speak well of you! for in the same manner did their fathers to the false prophets.—

But I say unto you that hear, Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you, Bless them that curse you, pray for them that despitefully use you. To him that smiteth thee on the one cheek offer also the other; and from him that taketh away thy cloak withhold not thy coat also. Give to everyone that asketh thee; and of him that taketh away thy goods ask them not again. And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise.

And if ye love them that love you, what (claim to) thanks have ye? for even sinners do the same. And if ye lend to them of whom ye hope to receive, what (claim to) thanks have ye? even sinners lend to sinners to receive again as much. But love your enemies, and do them good, and lend, never despairing; and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be sons of the Most High, for he is

what do ye more than others? do not even the Gentiles the same? Ye, therefore shall be complete (in your goodness) as your heavenly Father is complete.

kind to the unthankful and evil. Be ye merciful as the manner of your Father is to be merciful.

In both reports it is the purpose of the section commending the limitless goodness of God as the standard of right conduct toward our fellow-men to justify the assurances given in the Beatitudes. The "great reward in heaven" is the explicit ground of these assurances, a reward promised in Mt *on condition* of living up to a certain moral and religious standard, in Lk predicted *in spite of* certain present hardships. Mt legislates, Lk proclaims glad tidings. Mt depicts the ideal "disciple of the kingdom" over against the disciple of the Synagogue, Lk depicts the brotherhood of the elect as God sees them over against the favorites of fortune as the world sees them. In both cases the paradox must be resolved. Mt must show why Jesus offered the heavenly reward on other terms than the "righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees," Lk must show why he ventured to assure his "little flock" that, appearances to the contrary notwithstanding, "it is the sovereign decree (εὐδόκησεν) of your heavenly Father to give you the kingdom."

In the depiction of the Righteousness of Sons both reporters of the discourse are in agreement, an agreement which comes toward the close to be practically verbal. The common factor (Q) rests upon the principle of "grace," much as in Mk 10:13–31 and in the anti-legalistic parables of the Dissatisfied Wage-earners and the Servile Task (Lk 17:7–10). It is the same as in Paul's paraphrase of this ethic of the Imitation of God's goodness in Eph. 4:31–5:2. The historical situation presupposed on both sides is thus met. Having proclaimed the coming kingdom throughout Galilee, exhorting all to repentance, and having now withdrawn with his motley following from the hostile Synagogue, Jesus greets those who have accepted the glad tidings with a renewal of the assurance. He cannot do otherwise than answer the question we may imagine written on all these upturned faces, What, then, shall we do? How shall we know that this heavenly reward is really for us? Historically the S^q discourse on Filial Righteousness is what we should expect under the assumed circumstances.

But it does not follow that either form in which the discourse is reported gives a stenographic reproduction. Mt and Lk show different ideals in their records, both attaching more importance to practical and religious edification in their own age than to historical transmission. Stanton imagines two translations of a common Aramaic original. McNeile thinks it clear "that Mt and Lk employed

different recensions" of it. The point of divergence is where Lk adds the Woes (Lk 6:24–26); for as respects symmetry these seem to require another utterance at the close, to balance the previous pentad; as respects contents they occasion a very awkward transition in verse 27 ("But to you that hear I say"), hardly fitting the sequel, which contrasts conduct which may look for "great reward" with that which has no claim to "thanks." Whoever is responsible, Lk's version here gives evidence of change. His comparative presupposes a positive. Nor can it be a comparison of the present poor with the absent rich which was in the Speaker's mind. The comparison regarded conduct or conditions befitting heirs of the kingdom. It contrasted what others might so consider with the Speaker's paradoxical declaration. The clause "But to you that hearken I say" is therefore in reality a substitute for Mt's emphatic "But *I* say." Before it we must supply some conventional view which Jesus displaces by the assurance which follows: The expected inheritance is destined for those who are the "sons" according to the spirit. In substance the discourse is therefore a continuation of John's "Think not to say, 'We are Abraham's children' but repent." The principle of changed life (μετανοία) thereupon unfolded contrasts the "repentance" which really prepares for the kingdom with conventional repentance. It involves likeness of nature to the Father. It is an *imitatio Dei* which (as the sequel goes on to show) is more than mere imitation because rooted in the heart. This, then, is Lk's version of the discourse on Filial Righteousness. He has it from S, but perhaps through the medium of L.

In view of what we are compelled to suppose was the historical occasion for Jesus' discourse Mt's supplementation by addition of the (expanded) discourse on the New Torah has something to commend it. He understands by the "accepted views" Jesus would displace "the righteousness of scribes and Pharisees." As supplying the foil we expect Mt's report may perhaps be taken as somewhat more historical than that of Lk, which omits the specific application and presents a generalized *social* contrast corresponding to the description in Jas. 2:1–13 of "the law of liberty." Nevertheless we can only partially concur with the reasoning of Stanton and McNeile, that "Mt and Lk employed different recensions of Q."

For divergence on Lk's part, proved by comparison with Q, does not carry with it the assurance that Mt has not also diverged. On the contrary two facts indicate that the section of P^{mt} which we have designated the New Torah has been given the form of an agglutination for catechetic purposes, corresponding to the Lk (or L?) form of the Discourse on Filial Righteousness. These two facts are (1) an arrangement in literary or rhetorical symmetry covering both

divisions of the section and in some degree corresponding to the pentad (or decalogue) of the Beatitudes; (2) the disagreement between Mt and Lk as to the continuation after Mt 5:48. The literary symmetry is disregarded in both divisions by R^{mt} and is therefore not likely to be his own work. The insertion of ch. 6 between Mt 5:48 and 7:1 appears to violate an original connection preserved in Lk 6:36 ff. These two phenomena lead us to assume not "independent documents" in which the New Torah discourse circulated in different quarters, but simply the same redactional processes on both sides repeatedly exhibited by R^{mt} and R^{lk}. Mt dislocates and reagglutinates discourse from S. Lk (perhaps after L) stylizes.

For the nature of this New Torah section, and the reason why a portion of it intervenes between Mt 5:48 and 7:1 ff., utterances which by the testimony of Lk should be consecutive, we must refer the reader to our Appended Note VIII. As regards the interruption between Mt 5:48 and 7:1 ff. it is only fair to supply here the explanation of McNeile in his own words:

> The discourse on the Law (the New Torah discourse) was originally circulated as an independent document. Mt may have found it so, or it may already have been attached at some point (not necessarily in the Sermon) to the recension of Q which he used. Finding the sayings on Retaliation, and on Love and Hatred, arranged in the form in which Lk has them, he altered the order, adding verses 38 and 43, and ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, thus making them similar to the preceding sayings in his discourse.

The point of interest for students of the structure of Division B of Mt's first Book is that the New Torah section appears indeed, as Harnack maintains, to be alien to the Discourse on Filial Righteousness, which formed the nucleus of Mt's Sermon, and McNeile's suggestion of the manner of its intervention here has much to commend it. Whatever the derivation of the New Torah section, the hand which has adjusted it to a connection with the Discourse is almost certainly that of R^{mt}. This appears from form and interest alike. The expansion of the original triad into a pentad of antitheses would resemble the Matthean expansion of the five petitions of the Lord's Prayer into seven, and the expansion of the pentad of the Beatitudes into a decad. At all events the interest of the supplements is "Matthean" (*cf.* 5:7 with 23 f.). Above all the Thesis (5:17, 20) and the sub-head 6:1 (*cf.* "do your righteousness") are unmistakably from the hand of R, and it is under these rubrics that the two parts of the New Torah section are introduced.

On the other hand traits of both form and substance corroborate the feeling of McNeile and others that the New Torah, or "discourse on the Law" is "from the Lord himself and none other." It does

not appear, however, that we need resort to any "independent document," much less base on it any theory of an M source coextensive with Q. Other Q material shows similar triadic symmetry of form (*cf.* the Temptations and the Discourse on the Mission of the Baptist). It appears again in Mk 9:43–47, while Mk 10:1 ff. shows affinities of content with our S^q discourse. The non-appearance in Lk of the New Torah is accounted for by Lk's apparent adoption of the form of the Sermon belonging to L. We may therefore accept the strong impression of Sir John Hawkins above cited (p. 123) and hold to the derivation of the section on Spiritual Worship (6:2–6, 16–18) from S (in common with so much else of Mt's Sermon), *but from some other context.*[19] Our translation (Part III) will show in detail the interweaving effected by R between these two discourses, Filial Righteousness and Spiritual Worship.

The mass of displaced Q material which Mt attaches after the New Torah section carries forward the theme of the latter, viz.: Heavenly Reward. The refrain "Thy Father, which seeth in secret, shall reward thee" seems to suggest to the mind of R^{mt} the series: "Lay up Treasure in Heaven" (6:19–21 = Lk 12:33 f.); Singleness of Aim (6:22 f. = Lk 11:34–36), as against Serving Two Masters (6:24 = Lk 16:13), and Abiding Wealth (6:25–34 = Lk 12:22–31). This seems to take the place, to his feeling, of the assurances of heavenly reward (or reward and punishment) with which the remaining four Sermons are concluded. Verse 34, a popular maxim equivalent to the English "Do not borrow trouble" serves as R's summing up of the great Q discourse on Abiding Wealth before he resumes the thread of the discourse on Filial Righteousness. Mt 7:1–5 brings us again into coincidence with Lk 6:37–42 save that Lk in verses 37–39 has a longer form, perhaps expanded by the addition of the logion on Blind Leaders, which Mt places in 15:14 and 10:24 f. The displacement this time appears due to Lk, perhaps induced by the saying which follows (Remove the beam from thine own eye before seeking to cure the blindness of others). In reality the verses which follow (Mt 7:3–5 = Lk 6:41 f.) connect directly with the prohibition of censorious judgment (Mt 7:1 f = Lk 6:37 f.). Mt appends here another maxim (6:7), perhaps from Rabbinic sources, to close this portion of the discourse. It is difficult to see any connection between the theme "Judge not" and "Give not holy meat to dogs." Apparently Mt takes verse 5 (Cure thine own blindness before offering treatment to others) as a discouragement to premature missionary activity.

At this point occurs what we are disposed to call an example of Mt's habit of "bracketing." Part of the Q discourse on Prayer (Lk 11:1–13) had been incorporated by Mt in 6:9–15, omitting the

[19] A possible context for this P^{mt} section is suggested in Appended Note VIII.

narrative introduction and the accompanying parable. The remainder (Lk 11:9–13) is now brought in between the close of the section on Filial Righteousness and the colophon to the entire exposition of "the Law and the prophets" (verse 12=Lk 6:31 displaced, plus the R clause). It is possible that this remainder of S^q material was purposely reserved by Mt when making his supplement to 6:5–8 in order to attach after the section on Reward in heaven (6:19–7:6) an assurance of heavenly blessing corresponding to the promises which he appends at the close of each of the remaining discourses. The promise "Your Father in heaven shall give good things to them that ask him" does make a good ending immediately before the (displaced) Golden Rule and the summing up, "This is the law and the prophets." On the whole, however, it seems more probable in view of several analogous cases, that the attachment is made at this point merely to avoid loss through oversight. Not wishing to discard so edifying a promise along with the very colloquial parable and the narrative occasion, R brings it in at the first opportunity.

He has similarly "bracketed" (if McNeile be right) a section of Q (5:38–48) between the two parts of the New Torah section, the two logia on Singleness of Aim (6:22–24) between the two parts of the discourse on Abiding Wealth (Lk 12:33 f. and 22–31) and immediately after he "brackets" his Warning against False Teaching (7:15–20) between the two parts of Lk 13:23–27. Deliberate division would probably have resulted in a better connection. The process is probably to be accounted for by R's great familiarity with the material. Memory suggests an appropriate portion of the discourse and this part is at once inserted where the context requires. The remainder comes in as soon thereafter as R can find a reasonable opening. Mt 7:7–11 is thus attached somewhat haltingly, just before the colophon "This is the law and the prophets."

But the summary does not mark the end of the Discourse. It only concludes that portion of it which presents the true and right road to salvation. Before the close S (as represented by Q) had two more sections: In Lk 6:43 f. the first of these appears as an appropriate sequel[20] to the teaching on the Imitation of God. External conformity will not suffice, only deep-rooted likeness of nature will give the right to be called "sons and daughters of the Most High." This is the purport (in Lk) of the logion on figs and grapes coming only from a stock of their own kind. R^{mt} has given this saying, as we shall see, a peculiar application to his special foes, the "teachers of lawlessness," before coming again into the same channel of tradition as Lk in the final Application beginning "And why call ye me, 'Lord,' 'Lord,' and do not the things which I say?" We must give our

[20] See above, p. 180.

attention to this Matthean recast of S, placing it side by side with the Lukan transcript. The recast is "bracketed," as already described, between portions of the Q parable of the Near-shut Door (Lk 13:23–27), whose central verse alone fails to appear here because Mt gives its equivalent in 25:11 f. These enclosing sections must be presented first, thereafter the recast of Lk 6:43 f.

Lk 13:23 f., 26 f.	Mt 7:13 f., 21–23
And someone said to him, Lord, are the saved few in number? But he said to them, Struggle to enter through the narrow (opening of the) door, for many, I say unto you, will seek to enter and will not be able. . . .	Enter ye in through the narrow gate. For broad is the gate and roomy the road that leadeth to perdition, and many there be that go in by it; because narrow is the gate and straitened the road which leadeth into life, and few are they that find it. . . . Not everyone that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many will say unto me in that day: Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in thy name, and in thy name exorcise demons, and in thy name do many mighty works? And then I will profess to them, I never knew you, Depart from me, all ye that do lawlessness.
Then shall ye begin to say: We did eat and drink in thy presence, and thou didst teach (*al.* "walk") in our streets. And he will say, I tell you I care not whence you come, Depart from me, all ye workers of unrighteousness.	

In the expanded Matthean form of the discourse the figure of the thaumaturgists and exorcisers who in Mt's own time (Mk 9:38 f., Acts 19:13–16) are calling Jesus "Lord" and practicing their magic in his name, but without obedience to his commandment, has so completely eclipsed in the evangelist's mind that of the mere latecomers of the parable, who had put off till too late the opportunity of repentance, that only a few traces of the original representation remain. Moreover the figure of the "door" (θύρα) of opportunity, already almost shut and soon to be wholly closed, with which Jesus rebukes the idle question as to the number of the elect [21] has disappeared behind the conventional figure of the "Gate" (πύλη) of Righteousness (Ps. 118:19 f.) and the Two Ways familiar in Pythagorean and Orphic moral exhortation. The suggestion of the closing door, and especially the sentence "Depart from me ye workers of unrighteousness (ἀδικία) were called to Mt's mind by the opening words of the Q peroration "Why call ye me, 'Lord,' 'Lord,' and do not the things which I say?" This was enough to open the flood-

[21] A current bone of contention; see II Esdr. 7:47 f.; 8:1–3.

gates of his invective against the "false prophets, thaumaturgists, and exorcisers" who come professing the name of Christ (*cf.* 24:11 f., 24). The remainder of the section is thus recast:

Lk 6:43 f.	Mt 7:15–20
	Beware of the false prophets which come unto you in sheep's clothing but inwardly are ravening wolves. By their fruits ye shall know them.
For there is no sound tree that produces rotten fruit, nor again a rotten tree that produces sound fruit. For every tree is known by its own fruit; for men do not gather figs from thorns nor grapes from thistles.	Surely men do not gather grapes from thorns nor figs from thistles? So every good tree produces sound fruits, but the rotten tree produces bad fruits. A good tree cannot bear bad fruits nor a rotten tree sound fruits. Every tree that does not produce sound fruit shall be cut down and cast into the fire. So, then, ye shall know them by their fruits.

The motive and method of this recast speak for themselves. It is hardly needful to call attention again to the parable (rewritten from Mk) of the Tares in the Wheat with its elaborate Interpretation, or to the parable of the Sorted Catch, or the supplement to the parable of the Slighted Invitation, or to the stereotyped phrases about casting into the fire etc., to recognize the hand of R^{mt}. Verse 15 we have recognized above as his own personal heading for the section. Verse 19 takes its threat against the workers of "lawlessness" (*ἀνομία*) from the warning of the Baptist (Mt 3:10=Lk 3:9). Nothing is new save the special application of the material found in S. The denunciation is so much to Mt's taste that he repeats it in substance in 12:33 against his other *bête noire*, the hostile scribes.

Division B of Mt's first Book, unlike the four which follow, has no specially constructed close of its own. The closing parable of the incorporated discourse on Filial Righteousness serves the purpose better than any selection or composition of R's could do. Jesus commends the principle of Filial Righteousness which he has described as a true preparation for the coming Kingdom, comparing the man who follows it to one who builds a solid foundation on the rock. The fact that the auditors are still, as before, his personal following appears from the question with which the peroration begins: "Why call ye me 'Lord,' 'Lord'?" They are the Come-outers of Mk 3:7, as above noted. The section required, of course, no special adaptation by R to the larger context of the Sermon as he has expanded it; hence the substantial coincidence of Mt's version with

Lk's. Mt's own perorations in 10:40–42; 13:47–52; 18:23–35 and 25:31–46 are of different type.

The structure of Book I, A and B, is carried through the remaining four Books, as we shall see. But we must be on our guard against too great assumption of uniformity. In reality conformity would better express the relation than uniformity, for in several respects the Sermon of I, B stands apart. As we have just observed it lacks Mt's customary application at the close of a sanction of reward and punishment. Mt's four later applications, like his four later rubrics, conform to S, not S to Mt. What is more striking, it consists exclusively of non-Markan material. These facts, and the apparent adoption of its "transition formula" to serve as a uniform coupler at the close of each of the succeeding Books, suggests that Mt's structural scheme was not so much an invention of his own as an imitation of what he found in S. Not, indeed, as Godet and some of the older critics imagined, an imitation by division into five books of discourses, for only this one of the Sermons has a non-Markan basis; but as an adoption of the single instance of the S discourse on Filial Righteousness to make of it in the end a model for the remainder of the group. Having thus traced the workmanship of R in Book I we may continue in Chapter XIII with the purpose and structural design of Book II.

CHAPTER XIII

THE SECOND BOOK OF MT

From beginning to end Mt's second Book is adapted to the purpose of furnishing the Christian missionary or propagandist, a functionary whom we may designate a "gospeller," with the equipment and incentive for his work. For in this evangelizing work healing and exorcism played a leading part.

Not the outside references alone in Acts, in Paul, and in rabbinic literature, to these "signs of an apostle" give convincing testimony to the great effect the "gifts of healing" and "miracles" were expected to play (and actually did play) in the spreading of the faith, but in Mk 3:14–19, where we first hear of the appointment of the Twelve, it is expressly said that Jesus appointed them "that he might send them forth to make the proclamation *and* to have authority to exorcise demons." Mt in transcribing this verse in 10:1 extends the commission by adding one of his stereotyped phrases: "and to heal every disease and every sickness" (*cf.* 4:23 and 9:35). Mk himself in describing the report of the returning missionaries (6:12 f.) makes them appear to exceed their instructions by a similar addition: "They went out and proclaimed that men should repent; and exorcised many demons, *and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them.*" The addition merely reflects the actual practice of apostolic times as described in Jas. 5:14, but the coincident phrase καὶ νόσους θεραπεύειν of Lk 9:1 and Mt 10:1 would hardly appear coincidently in Mt and Lk without authority in S.[1]

Division A

Mt's second Book really represents a handbook for missionaries in what moderns would call *medical* service. Its narrative introduction (II, A), therefore, naturally consists of stories of the exorcisms and healing miracles of Jesus, interspersed with a few anecdotes of the calling of disciples to accompany him. The particular problem involved in Division A is the arrangement of these anecdotes, which form a group of ten Mighty Works, subdivided at 8:17 by a Scripture Fulfilment with transition at 9:8 to the Markan group Mk 2:13–22;

[1] On the gift of "miracles" as characteristic of the primitive "apostle" see S. J. Case, *Experience with the Supernatural in Early Christian Times*, 1929, p. 25 f.: "Apparently in Paul's day power to perform miracles was assumed to be an apostolic credential (II Cor. 12:11 f.)."

5:1–43. This problem has been discussed by Sir John C. Hawkins under the title "Disarrangement of Mk in Mt 8–9" in *The Expository Times* (XII, 471 ff., and XIII, 20 ff.), and more recently in *HS*, p. 167.[2] From the latter work we may cite a single sentence with its accompanying footnote:

> In the course of chapters viii and ix (of Mt), between the first and second collections of sayings, we have a collection of *ten* miracles, which is made up in a very unchronological way, but which reminds one irresistibly of the enumerations in the *Pirqe Aboth* (v. 5 and 8), "Ten miracles were wrought for our fathers in Egypt, and ten by the sea. . . . Ten miracles were wrought in the Sanctuary."

The footnote attached to the clause "made up in a very unchronological way" is as follows:

> Unchronological, because (i) Mt brings down to this division of his narrative three miracles which Mk and Lk place considerably earlier, viz. the healings of the leper (Mt 8:2–4; Mk 1:40–45; Lk 5:12–16), of Peter's wife's mother, with the subsequent cures at eventide (Mt. 8:14–17; Mk 1:29–34; Lk 4:38–41), and of the paralytic (Mt 9:2–8; Mk 2:1–12; Lk 5:17–26). And (ii) the two briefly recorded miracles in Mt 9:27–31 and 32–34 are so strikingly similar to those recorded later on, viz. in Mt 20:29–34 and 12:22–34 respectively (see pp. 93 ff.), that the suggestion naturally occurs that Mt inserted this anticipatory mention of them in order to make up the conventional number of "ten miracles." For it seems very difficult to suggest any other reason for inserting them. In these chapters the only important passage unconnected with the miracles is the call of Matthew, etc., in 9:9–17: in all three Gospels it follows the healing of the paralytic, and the anti-Pharisaic element in both incidents may have caused so close an association (whether documentary or oral) between them that Mt transferred them both together.

With the substance of this important extract we must express our full agreement. Mt's grouping is altogether "unchronological." Had he given any consideration to the order of Mk he could easily have made his extracts from Mk 4:35–5:20 in 8:23–34, from Mk 2:1–22 in 9:1–17 and from Mk 5:21–43, conform much more nearly to the sequence of the Gospel from which he took them. Emphatically Mt's arrangement is not for historical but for pragmatic purposes.

The specific nature of this pragmatic purpose is made apparent by the exceptions made to the rule of narrating miracles only. Sir John speaks of "the call of Matthew, etc., in 9:9–17" as "the only important passage unconnected with the miracles." But we must claim another exception. Surely the call of the scribe and "another disciple" drawn from S in 8:19–22 (= Lk 9:57–62) is not a story of miracle. Nor

[2] Also in my own article "Editorial Arrangement in Mt 8–9" in *The Expositor* for March, 1920 (XIX, 111, pp. 200–218).

was it needful, if the dominant motive in Mt's mind had been the formation of a group of Ten Mighty Works, to take up along with Mk 1:40–2:17 the succeeding context about the question of "the disciples of John" in Mk 2:18–22. However, the Q addition at the close of the series of Ten Mighty Works in 9:35–38, largely recast in R's own language (*cf.* 9:35 with 4:23 and 10:1) and leading directly to the Discourse of Division B, reveals Mt's chief concern. It shows that his really dominant interest was to convey the lesson of Wonder-working Faith, and this especially *for the disciples' benefit.*

Sir John's suggestion of a numerical intention and his comparison to the groups of "ten mighty works" in *Pirqe Aboth* and other talmudic enumerations are important; but they do not supply the key motive for the composition as a whole. The curious appending in 9:18–26 *after* the proper climax of the raising from the dead of Jairus' Daughter of two more "briefly recorded" and really duplicate miracles, is probably to be explained by a numerical aim. But this effort to reach a total of ten appears quite belated, and thereby shows how it falls short of explaining the formation of the entire group. It looks as though it had not occurred to Mt to make up a total of ten until on reaching the climax at 9:26 he observed that he had related thus far *eight* mighty works and that he need only attach (in brief mention) two more, to make up the parallel to the mighty works of Moses. The addition of Mt 9:27–34 [3] is too much like an afterthought to supply the constructive idea of the whole group.

Chronology, we are sure, has nothing to do with Mt's arrangement of his material for Division A. Again the forming of a list of ten mighty works exhibiting the power of the "prophet like unto Moses" has little effect beyond the appending of 9:27–34. Division B supplies the key. The real motive for Division A is the teaching required by itinerant "gospellers" concerning the power of Wonder-working Faith. Indeed we have a striking proof that these "gospellers," to whom the Discourse of Division B is addressed, are really from the beginning foremost in Mt's mind in the notable change made by him at 9:8 in transcribing Mk 2:1–12.

Mk 2:12	Mt 9:8
So that all were amazed and glorified God, saying, We never saw the like.	But the multitudes were afraid and glorified God, ***who had given such authority unto men.***

Mt is quite in earnest about the association of power to heal with "authority to proclaim forgiveness of sins" (*cf.* Jn 20:23; Jas. 5:15). The authority of *Jesus* Mt takes for granted; his interest is to show that it is transmitted to "men" who still go forth in Jesus' name

[3] Properly 33. Verse 34 does not appear in the better (β) text.

healing and proclaiming the (messianic) forgiveness of sins. Mt 8–9 is therefore an introduction to the Missionary's Handbook of apostolic times.

After Book I, with its description of Jesus' proclamation of repentance in view of the coming Kingdom and its Discourse on Righteousness, it may of course be assumed that Jesus' disciples require no further instruction regarding their preaching. It is their mission of healing for which they need to be prepared, and the groups of anecdotes which follow, divided at 8:17 by a closing Scripture quotation, are directed to this end. From the constituent elements of the respective groups we may surmise that the intention was to furnish the needed instruction in three lines of teaching. The first group, in 8:1–17, relates three typical healings of Jesus: (1) Cleansing the Leper, verses 1–4, (2) Healing the Centurion's Boy, verses 5–13, (3) Healing of Peter's Wife's Mother. Our surmise that these are intended as typical examples of Jesus' healing ministry, is borne out by the appended quotation from Is. 53:4 (Hebr. text),[4] "Himself took our infirmities and bare our diseases."

A second group appears in 8:18–9:8. This again consists of a series of three works of superhuman "authority" arranged climactically: (1) Command of Stormy Winds, verses 23–27, (2) Command over a Host of Demons, verses 28–34, (3) Authority to Forgive Sins, 9:1–8.

A formal difference between this second group and its predecessor is significant: It is prefaced in 8:18–22 by an extract from S^q, of which Lk 9:57–60 gives a parallel extending to a third example. The extract describes the call of two disciples upon whom Jesus lays certain exacting conditions of discipleship. Of these candidates for the service the first is a scribe, whose offer to follow is met by the warning from Jesus to expect a wandering and homeless life. The second candidate is "one of the disciples" apparently not yet ready to break off home ties. Jesus warns him that the service called for is so urgent that even the claims of filial piety must give way to it. The prefacing of the second triad of miracles by this double warning of Q sayings can hardly have any other motive than to prepare applicants for the charge of "gospelling" on behalf of the churches by pointing out the severity of its requirements. Mt does not include the third instance of the S group as it stands in Lk 9:57–62 prefixed to the Sending of the Seventy (10:1–16). This is the offer of "another" to "follow" after bidding farewell to his family, met by Jesus' re-

[4] On this extraordinary application of the *locus classicus* for the Greek-speaking Church justifying its doctrine of forgiveness through the blood of the cross, a verse which in the LXX rendering reads "This man beareth our sins and suffereth on our account," see Appended Note V.

jection of those that "look back." The third instance would have been less suited to Mt's purpose.

Formally this preface to the second group of miracles corresponds to that prefixed in 9:9–13 to the third group, the story of "Matthew" forsaking all to join the company of disciples. Pragmatically its motive can only be such as above described.

The group of three miracles which follows the prefatory warning of 8:18–22 shows by the nature of the selected anecdotes, arranged not in chronological sequence but climactically, that all are intended to illustrate the "authority" of the Son of man committed to his representatives. The first example (Rebuke of the Storm—regarded as of demonic origin; *cf.* Mk 4:39) and the second (Exorcising a Host of Demons) obviously illustrate the statement of Mk 3:15 that the Twelve were to "have authority to cast out demons, and in addition the assurance of Lk 10:17–20 of authority "over all the power of the enemy." Mk's conception of Jesus' "authority" to exorcise is shown in 1:27 (where we should punctuate "A new teaching! With authority he commandeth even the unclean spirits and they obey him!"), also in 1:34, 39; 3:11 f., 15; 4:39, where the formula of 1:25 recurs, and 5:1–20, where we find the basis of the story of 1:21–28 giving Mk's theory.[5] Mt avoids the theory but retains the basic anecdote. His third example in the group is Jesus' proof of Authority as Son of Man to Forgive Sins, even while as yet "upon earth." In Mk 2:1–12 this defense against the murmur of the scribes is made by Jesus' command to the paralytic, "Rise, take up thy bed and go to thy house." Mt transcribes (with his usual condensation) in 9:1–8.

One need not be a practitioner of psychic therapy to understand that *unauthoritative* commands to the "possessed" are likely to be disastrous to the would-be exorciser. The apostolic Church told anecdotes of unauthorized exorcism in the name of "Jesus whom Paul preacheth" like that of Acts 19:13–16. Experience would soon teach that exorcists who attempted the work committed to them with a "doubtful mind" met as little success as when delivering the apostolic message of absolution without the conviction which had sounded through the assurances of Jesus. Hence the primitive rebukes of "double-mindedness" (διψυχία) in Jas. 1:6–8, *Didaché* iv. 4, Hermas *Vis.* iv. 4, etc., and the demands to exercise a faith that "doubts not whether a thing shall be, or shall not be" in Mk (11:22–24) and S^q (Mt 17:20 = Lk 17:6). "Mountain-moving faith," as Paul also calls it (I Cor. 13:2), belongs to the gift of "miracles," but the gift is not bestowed on the half-hearted. Hence Mt's examples.

[5] See my article in *ZNW* for 1905 (VI, pp. 153–158) entitled "The Markan Theory of Demonic Recognition of the Christ."

Exorcism was the special function of the apostolic "gospeller." If we observe how Mt's second group of "mighty works" is made up there will remain small room to doubt why it is framed as it is. Such room for doubt as might remain would disappear if note were also taken of Mt's special phrases and supplements interjected into his Markan material. In the Stilling of the Storm (8:23–27 = Mk 4:35–41) he interjects a rebuke of the disciples before that of the storm: "Why are ye fearful, ye half-believers" (ὀλιγόπιστοι). The Gerasene (Mt "Gadarene") Demoniac story is so greatly condensed that the reader fails to see why a whole "herd" of swine are needed to afford lodgment for only *two* demons, for the "legion" feature has disappeared. That is one of the proofs of Markan priority. But a significant new feature is introduced of which we must take account presently. Finally the miracle of the Paralytic made to Walk, while deprived (by condensation) of the picturesque Markan feature of the letting down through the roof, with consequent obscuration of the clause "seeing their faith" (another proof of Markan priority), is adapted, as already shown, to emphasize the lesson to the "gospeller" that his message of (messianic) forgiveness of sins is also to be given on "authority" (*cf.* Jn 20:23; Jas. 5:13–15). Indeed the clause "I believe in the forgiveness of sins" would not appear as part of the apostolic baptismal formula had it not been the conviction of the apostolic Church (a conviction supported by the gift of "healings") that its messengers were commissioned of God "to declare unto his people (they being duly penitent) the absolution and remission of their sins."

To be of any value this "absolution," like the exorcisms, would have to be "with authority." We have defined as the probable purpose of the section Mt 8:18–9:8, to encourage the applicant ready to undertake the "gospeller's" work undeterred by a life of homeless wandering, detached from close family ties, by assuring him that "authority over unclean spirits" and "over all the power of the Evil One" is committed to him if only he does not "doubt in his heart." If the compiler's aim was indeed, as we have surmised, to send forth not only exorcisers and healers but "men" conscious of a divine authorization to declare to the penitent the forgiveness of their sins, then no selection could have been better among the accounts of Jesus' ministry of faith than just the series: Command of Stormy Winds, verses 23–27; Command of Hosts of Demons, verses 28–34; Authority to Forgive Sins, 9:1–8. All three examples are naturally taken from Mk, but chronological order is totally disregarded, the examples being given in climactic sequence; for "authority to forgive sins" can come from God alone.

The third group of Faith Wonders, like the second, is prefaced by

a narrative illustrative of the Call of Disciples. From Mk 2:14–22 Mt takes the story of the Call of Matthew, substituting this name for "Levi" in the original (if our conjecture made above, pp. 39 ff. be correct) because he found in his List of the Twelve (10:3) the gloss "the publican" attached (as he supposed) to this name.[6] To the question why he did not break off at verse 13, but transcribed the remainder of the Markan paragraph down to verse 17 = Mk 2:37 f., it is perhaps a sufficient answer to observe that Mt finds a place for practically everything in Mk, and that no other can be suggested more apt to satisfy him than this. Nevertheless we may suggest also that there is more of appropriateness to the inclusion here of the reference to the "disciples of John" than at first sight appears. To the apostolic Church the great distinction between the baptism of John and its own was that John's did not convey the "gifts of the Spirit" including that of "miracles" (Acts 8:13—Simon Magus in church tradition is reckoned a disciple of John—and 18:24–19:7; Jn 10:41). R^{mt}, therefore, might consider it appropriate to retain here the somewhat depreciatory reference in verses 14–17 to the fastings of John's disciples and the Pharisees (*cf.* Mk 9:29, β text).

One may be in considerable doubt as to the limits of Mt's final group of Faith Wonders which begins with the Call of Matthew (9:9–13), but touches of R's hand both in the Markan portion (9:18–26) and the non-Markan (verses 27–33) leave little uncertainty as to the didactic purpose. Condensation of the story of the Healing of the Bloody Flux and Raising of Jairus' Daughter (Mk 5:21–43) has reduced its compass by nearly two-thirds while enhancing the wonder beyond the psychologically credible (another proof of Markan priority). Thus Jairus evinces from the outset an incredible degree of faith by coming to ask from Jesus an unheard-of miracle: "My daughter has just died; but come and lay thine hand upon her and she shall live." In the interwoven Healing of the Bloody Flux similar condensation leaves only the moral of the story, "Courage, daughter, thy faith hath saved thee." In 9:27–31 there are resemblances both to Mk 10:47; 8:23, 26; 1:43–45 and to Mt 12:22–24 which fully justify Hawkins' verdict above quoted concerning the editorial origin of this and its companion miracle in verses 32f.[7] Nevertheless the faith lesson is so far from being forgotten in the Healing of the Blind that Jesus is made even to put the question "Believe ye that I am able to do this?" before accomplishing the miracle. Thus the teaching

[6] Intended by the glossator, who followed the "Western" reading of Mk 2:14, for "James son of Alphaeus."

[7] On the phraseology of verses 32 f. as indicating editorial composition see Allen, *ICC ad loc.* and *cf.* McNeile, Additional Note, p. 128. Verse 34 is spurious; *cf.* β text.

of the indispensableness of faith, which was taken over from Mk in 9:2 and 22, is not lost sight of. There is a difference, however, from the lesson as inculcated in the preceding group. In the Stilling of the Storm (8:23–27 = Mk 4:35–41) the moral is the Indispensableness of Faith for *the worker of the miracle*. In the group with which we are now dealing it is the Indispensableness of Faith *in the beneficiary*. This seems to be the point emphasized in all of the miracles of this group save the last.[8] We may therefore regard it as probable that it furnished to R his pragmatic motive in grouping together the material of 9:9–34.

Whence, then, does he derive this non-Markan material? Should we, or should we not separate the two supplementary miracles appended by R in verses 27–34 from the two-fold Markan miracle which precedes in 9:18–26? Certain phenomena not yet considered confirm the verdict of their editorial and duplicate character. There is a curious doubling of the recipient in the Healing of the Blind (9:27–31) which had occurred previously in the Gadarene Exorcism (8:28–34). It is commonly explained by the idea of compensation, as though R might have felt it necessary to make good the omission of the Capernaum Exorcism (Mk 1:23–28) so closely similar to the Gerasene in the utterance of the demoniac, or for the omission of the Opening of Blind Eyes at Bethsaida (Mk 8:22–26) because of its anticipation in 9:27–31. The explanation is hardly adequate. The device would be unintelligible and implies a limit on the number of Jesus' miracles which R certainly did not feel. More probably R's aim is apologetic and harmonistic. His omission of the Exorcism in the Synagogue (Mk 1:23–28) was intentional, as can be seen from his rejection of the Markan theory.[9] Sceptics had doubtless pointed to the duplication of Mk 1:24 in 5:7. But the cancellation of one of the two exorcisms in Mt could not silence opponents. The Church would be accused of repeating the same story under inconsistent circumstances. Mt's doubling device made it possible to throw responsibility for a variant tradition on "the other witness." The same simple device would serve to explain certain suspicious likenesses between the two accounts of Jesus' Opening of Blind Eyes in Mk 8:22–26 and 10:46–52. Mt betrays his consciousness that the two may be mere variants by blending features from each in his conflation of 9:27–31; but he leaves room to evade the charge of variation in the testimony by summoning two witnesses. On the other hand he does not hesitate in verses 32 f. to create new objections by "fash-

[8] The failure may be due to R's selection of a story closely linked in the tradition with the preceding (Opening of Blind Eyes, Unstopping of Deaf Ears; *cf.* 12:22 f.), or, if verse 34 be genuine, to the bitter anti-Pharisaism of R.

[9] See my article in *ZNW* above cited, p. 170.

ioning a short account of the healing of a deaf demoniac from phrases which for the most part occur again in the Gospel."[10] There would seem to have been a shortage of material suitable for completing the decad of Mighty Works.

The conjecture is allowable that the original group of Faith Wonders leading up to the Mission of the Twelve consisted as in Mk 4:35–6:6 of a pentad, beginning, as in Mk, with the Stilling of the Storm, and closing with the Raising of Jairus' Daughter.[11] Indeed Mk himself may derive his pentad from some orally current group of this kind. R^{mt} will then be responsible for prefixing to Mk's pentad the triad descriptive of Jesus' own work as the Healer predicted in Is. 53:4 constructed from S and Mk in 8:1–17, for expanding it by the insertion of 9:2–17 (=Mk 2:1–22), and for supplementing it by the added pair of miracles of 9:27–33, thus raising the total number of miracles to *ten*. He may also have replaced other material by Markan in the pentad. The suggestion is made only as a possibility, yet there are several considerations which speak in its favor.

1. The Scripture fulfilment closing the paragraph 8:1–17 is certainly from N; for it cites Is. 53:4 in the Hebrew text in a sense incompatible with that given it by all the Greek-speaking churches. The verse marks a division between the prefixed triad and the rest of the decad not elsewhere exemplified in it. The combination of materials and arrangement of their order in the triad are characteristic. The Leper comes first, to illustrate 5:17 ff.; then the Centurion's Boy, illustrating the universalism of the gospel. Peter's Wife's Mother comes last because of verse 16, to which the Scripture fulfilment had doubtless already been attached in N.

2. The Q element of 8:18–22 certainly figured in S as introductory to the Mission of the Twelve; because such is also its sequel in Lk 9:57–60. The Q material continues in 9:35 ff.

3. The continuous Mk section 9:2–17 is in part foreign to the theme, as well as locally and chronologically out of order. We should expect a group of anecdotes of Faith Wonders to consist of not more than five, and to culminate in an account of Raising the Dead. A group having greater appropriateness to the immediate theme comes to the surface if we leave out of account 9:2–17 and 27–34. The remainder combines Q (8:18–22) with Mk. For those who follow Streeter in the "four-document" theory 8:18–34 and 9:18–26 would be due to M, the insertion of 9:1–17 (with editorial adjustment in verses 1 and 18) and appending of verses 27–33 to R. It is safer not to venture beyond the supposition that the Charge to Gospellers in

[10] Allen, *ICC ad loc.* Note the use of Mk 1:45 in 9:30 f., and *cf.* McNeile *ad loc.*

[11] Such is the actual order of Lk 8:22–9:6; but this may be due solely to the anticipation of Mk 6:1–6 in Lk 4:16 ff.

S had also its introductory group of five (?) Faith Wonders here represented by those of Mk 4:35–5:43.

R concludes Division A of his second Book by repeating in 9:35 his formula of 4:23 coined on the basis of Mk 1:39: "And Jesus went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing every disease and every sickness" (*cf.* also 10:1). It is worthy of note that he has included all the available material of Mk down to Mk 2:22, not excepting the disobedience of the healed leper to Jesus' command (Mk 1:45) which Lk 5:15 smoothes away. Mt transfers it to the account of the two Blind Men of 9:30 f. There is condensation leading to the dropping out of non-essential elements of particular anecdotes, as of Mk 1:35–39; 2:2–4, and parts of 4:35–5:43; there is also complete rearrangement of order with anticipation of material required for the didactic purposes defined above. The List of the Twelve (Mk 3:14–19) naturally finds its place before the Sending (Mt 10:2–4). The only *omitted* anecdote is that of Mk 1:23–28, whose unavailability has been explained. This leaves nothing unutilized of Mt's primary source save what was directly connected with the next Discourse, the two Sabbath Conflicts of Mk 2:23–3:6, and the logion on Spiritual Kin with the parenthesis, Mk 3:22–30. This parenthesis is a flagrant case of prolepsis, constituting one of Mk's explanatory digressions to offset the logion. Mt restores it to the place which Lk also attests as its true context in 12:22 ff. = Lk 11:14 ff., but not without leaving a substitute in 9:32 f. Thus the disarrangement of Mk's order is much less than at first sight appears. It amounts only to the collecting of the Ten Mighty Works from Mk 1–5 as an appropriate prelude to the Mission of the Twelve. We have seen some reason to believe that even for this dislocation there may have been precedent in some form of primitive Manual for Gospellers earlier than either Mk or Mt.

Division B

The highly composite nature of the Discourse to which Mt has thus led up hardly needs demonstration. In the translation of Part III the reader will have opportunity to see how the dovetailing method of Mt, already observed in Book I, is carried out in detail. Our introduction to the Discourse must limit itself to an indication of its general structure and outline, to its purpose as shown by adaptation of material, and to certain inferences as to the environment which might give rise to the Discourse as a whole and to its constituent parts.

The general structure and outline are easily determined. A Prelude (9:36–38) drawn from Mk and Q (Mk 6:34; Lk 10:2) states

the purpose of the Sending. The Apostles are to be (a) leaders of the shepherdless flock, (b) harvesters of the ripened crop, figures which doubtless reflect the authentic feeling and attitude of Jesus. Thereafter follows the Sending. This is coincidently stated by both sources [Mt 10:1=Mk 6:7=Lk 9:1 (10:1)], but is interrupted in Mt by a parenthetic List of the Twelve which varies somewhat from Mk 3:16–19=Lk 6:14–16. The account of the Sending continues in verses 5–8 with a specific Charge, limiting the mission of the Twelve to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel" and defining its message and its activities. The nucleus of this Charge is from S^q (Lk 9:2=10:9). The limitation (verses 5 f.) embodies in verse 5 a restriction historically justified by the testimony of Paul (Rom. 15:8; Gal. 2:9), but not elsewhere recorded. R himself supplies the embroidery of verse 6 (from 15:24) and 8 (*cf.* 11:5=Lk 7:22). Thereafter follow the Directions for the Work (verses 9–15=Mk 6:8–11=Lk 9:3–5=10:4–12).

A totally different situation is presupposed in the paragraphs which follow down to the closing logion of verses 40–42. Here we find the proper ending of the Mission of the Twelve, for in Lk 10:16=Mk 9:37b this appropriate promise forms the close of the Discourse. Mt, after his custom of elaborating sanctions for commandments, expands the nucleus by adding from unknown sources the promise of reward for hospitality to "prophets" and "just men" (*cf.* 13:17) and that from Mk 9:41 so splendidly elaborated in the Judgment Scene of 25:31–46. Between this close of 10:40–42 and the Sending to which it belongs R has interposed two long paragraphs, the first of which (10:16–25=Mk 13:9–13=Lk 21:12–17, 19 with Lk 12:11 f. and 6:40) warns of Persecution to be endured from a hostile world; the second (verses 26–39=Lk 12:2–9, 51–53; 14:26 f.; 17:33 with touches coincident with Mk 4:22; 8:38 and 34 f. and 13:12) encourages martyrs to Fearless Confession.

These two interjected paragraphs carry the reader far beyond the situation contemplated in the Sending into Galilee. No return of the Twelve is contemplated, the horizon extends temporally to the second Coming (verse 23) geographically to the ends of the earth (verse 22). The persecutions to be suffered are at the hands of "governors and kings," before whom confessors will be brought to trial "for a witness to them and to the Gentiles." The Spirit of their Father will be given them as their Advocate at these tribunals to teach them what they shall say (verses 19 f.=Lk 12:11 f.).

The framer of this expanded form of the Markan Discourse (R^{mt}) has obviously lost sight of the situation with which he began (another indication of Mk's priority). The scenes are no longer those of hospitable Galilee, where a kindly reception could be anticipated and, according to Lk 22:35, was actually experienced. Galilee and the

mission to heal and proclaim the coming kingdom has faded out of the picture. In its place has come the world-wide persecution of the apostolic and post-apostolic age. The compiler has ceased to be a historian, he is now a preacher addressing his own age under color of prediction by Jesus. For indeed according to Lk 22:35–38 and Jn 15:16–16:33 Jesus did give just such warnings, predictions, and promises, though on an occasion explicitly distinguished from this Galilean Sending. They form part of a different Sending in his parting words in the upper room under the immediate shadow of the cross. Nor is it Lk and Jn alone who indicate the proleptic character of these Matthean extracts. Mk also in 13:9–13 brings down the main portion of the paragraph to the later date, so that Mt himself on reaching this context in ch. 24 only condenses and paraphrases, refusing to duplicate what he had already given here in the very words of Mk.

The Encouragement to Martyrdom (verses 26–39) is equally proleptic. Here the situation is again that, not of Galilee but of a hostile world in which the Christian confessing his Lord invites a martyr's doom. Again the parallels bear their witness to the anachronism. Mk 4:22 = Lk 8:17 = 12:2 f. is indeed a stray, and Mk 8:34 f. and 38 may not be in their original setting. But Mk 13:12, which repeats in substance Mt 10:34–36 = Lk 12:51–53, makes the same tacit protest as before against Matthean displacement.

In view of previous experience of Mt's method of agglutination it is clear that in his second as in his first Discourse he has built up a great composite. The nucleus of the Mission of the Twelve in Galilee (10:1, 9–15) has been elaborated into a general commission into all the world and down to the end of time.

Both purpose and date of this composite are easy to infer. If the reference of Mk 13:9–13 to such defenses as those of Paul before Felix, Agrippa, and Nero, in combination with other indications of that earlier Gospel compel us to bring its date down to post-apostolic times, certainly the adaptation of this Markan material in Mt 10:17–22 compels us to descend to a still later date for Mt. The pragmatic motive also speaks clearly for this period of world-wide persecution. Nor does the inclusion of the prohibition of leaving "the cities of Israel" in 10:23 militate against it. As McNeile well says,

> It is not the band of missionaries, but the community of the disciples which is to flee, and the cities of Israel, *i.e.*, the Jewish cities in Palestine, will afford them enough places of refuge, because the Son of Man is coming so soon.

Removal from Jerusalem is certainly contemplated, but (if McNeile be right) the flight from the siege to Pella described by Eusebius is not in the writer's thought. The headquarters of the Church may

pass "from city to city" to avoid persecution, but only a Jewish city (Kokaba?) may be considered their capital. Antioch, and probably Caesarea as well, are thus excluded. Doubtless the writer's expectation was that Jerusalem itself would be the scene of the Lord's return. But twice already the Church had been driven from Jerusalem, once by persecution in A.D. 42 and once by the siege in A.D. 67. Mt could not but sanction this, but he forbids permanent removal to a Gentile (or Samaritan?) city. The prohibition is like the title "the Holy City" in 4:5 and "the city of the Great King" in 5:35 in the witness it bears to a typically Jewish-christian source; but certainly R was not conscious of any incompatibility between it and the command to Go into all the world and preach (28:19). For him, as for his source, the earthly center of the Church remains in "Israel" until the Lord's return; preferably in Jerusalem, but with the occasional necessity of taking refuge in some other "city of Israel." North-Syrian (Nazarene) Jewish Christianity, as we know, was heartily in sympathy with Gentile missions.

The case is somewhat different with the prohibition to *preach* in Samaria or a Hellenistic town (10:5). We cannot imagine this logion being *composed* by the author of 28:19, but it obviously could be *incorporated* by him if he regarded the limitation as temporary. Such a standpoint would be precisely that of the *Preaching of Peter*, which forbids missions to the Gentiles until after "twelve years" from the crucifixion. The date 42 A.D. coincides with the persecution of Agrippa and the martyrdom of James son of Zebedee. We know from Paul that the limitation was still felt by Peter and James and John at a date even later than this (Gal. 2:9). It is disregarded in Mt 28:19. Hence the *incorporation* of the ancient limitation in 10:5, even if the sense R gives it be not its original sense, is no proof of R's early date. Individual P logia such as 7:6 and 10:5 may well be primitive, but the working over of the Charge to the Twelve from the primitive form shown in Mk 6:7–13 to that of a Discourse to Gospellers who must be warned of world-wide persecution and encouraged to fearless martyrdom is one of many proofs that *this Gospel as a whole* does not antedate the persecution of Domitian.

If by "early" a date be meant within the age of the Apostles, as Clement defines it, that is, before the death of Nero, we cannot affirm it even for Mk. In fact the present section suggests that not even S, earlier as it seems to be than either Mt or Mk, can go back to this age. We must observe the fact that the conflating of the two discourses so clearly distinguished in Lk 22:35 f., the one a Mission in Galilee, the other a Farewell of Warning as Jesus goes to his fate, does not originate with R^{mt}, but had at least a beginning in S. This appears from Mt 10:16.

For no ingenuity can dispel the fact that the anachronistic transition in Mt 10:16 from the Directions to the Twelve (10:9–15) to Warnings of Persecution (verses 17–23) is not the work of R but of some predecessor. "Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves" is out of all harmony with the preceding sending to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Yet the connection belongs unmistakably to the common non-Markan Source (*cf.* Lk 10:3). Its position in Mt is indeed less incongruous than in Lk, but it belongs to S^q *and in this context.*

Another phenomenon is difficult to explain if R be made responsible for the prolepsis. If the Warning of World Persecution and Promise of the Spirit (Mt 10:17–25) stood in S at the late point in the story to which Mk 13:9–13; Lk 22:35 ff.; Jn 15–16 and its own implications would refer it, why does it appear as part of the Galilean ministry in Lk 12:11 f.? The same question may be asked regarding the Encouragement to Fearless Martyrdom (Mt 10:26–33). If the prolepsis is due to R^{mt} why should this paragraph also appear in Lk 12:2–9? There seems to be no escape from the inference that in S itself a process of agglutination had already taken place similar to what we observe in Mt, and that this agglutination involved displacement for didactic purposes of sections such as those just cited. On the other hand we must recognize that other collections made on the biographic principle of arrangement exemplified in L and Lk preserved in some cases a more historical order. Without this latter assumption it would be difficult to account for the more authentic order of Lk 22:35 ff. and Jn 15–16.

This conviction is confirmed when we observe the treatment of the Mission in Galilee in Lk 9 and 10. Here the critic counts himself most fortunate in that Lk, unlike Mt, has not interwoven Mk and S^q, but under the device of two Sendings, one of the Twelve, another of the Seventy,[12] has given us in 9:1–6 his transcription of Mk 6:6–13 and in 10:1–16 his transcription of S. In the latter we do find interesting and valuable variations from Mk which carry out other indications from Mk 1:1–13 and elsewhere that Mk is dependent on S. But we do not find what we naturally hope for, an order superior to Mk's. On the contrary Lk 10:1–24 (for we must include the entire context both of S^q and P^{lk}) we meet with some of the most conspicuous examples of collocation *ad vocem* (*e.g.*, verses 12–14, and 17, 20, 21, "joy," "rejoice in the Spirit," 22, 23 "turning to the disciples," [13] besides the anachronistic "Behold, I send you forth as

[12] The fact that this is mere literary device is proved by the reference in 22:35 to the direction as to equipment as having been addressed *to the Twelve*, whereas in 10:4 it is addressed *to the Seventy*.

[13] Cancelled in verse 22, *a* text.

sheep in the midst of wolves" (verse 3) already referred to. On this showing S, when at last we are able to place it alongside of Mk in its own connection, does not indicate that freedom from pragmatic agglutination which we anticipate in really primitive documents. On the contrary, so far as the instance goes, it suggests that even the S^q discourses also came from groupings originally built up to provide appropriate readings for particular occasions, such as the instruction of neophytes (Filial Righteousness) or the ordination of "gospellers." As critical analysis traces the ultimate sources further and further back the connection revealed is not as a rule more chronological and historical but more pragmatic.

The composition and structure of Mt's second Book throws an interesting light in two directions. It enables the critic, as just observed, to form a clearer conception of the process by which groups of "sayings and doings of the Lord" may have been collected in days preceding the Reminiscences of Peter's Preaching which we know as the Gospel of Mk, an authoritative composition whose outline became dominant for all later evangelists. The method is traceable even earlier still when our Second Source, soon to be combined with Mk by Lk and Mt, was in process of formation. The Gospel critic should avail himself of every hint of this method whether as exemplified in the *Redesammlung* of S or the διήγησις of L, in order to pave the way toward reconstruction.

But the historian of the apostolic Church will also find fruitful a comparison of this Second Book of Mt with the directions of *Didaché* xi–xiii for the Church's reception and treatment of itinerant "prophets and apostles." As one reads the examples drawn from the sayings and doings of the Lord collected in Mt 8–10 in their grouping and application, their exhortations to self-renunciation and devotion even to martyrdom, their encouragements to an utterance of the message of healing and forgiveness of sins with "authority," their assurance of victory "over all the power of the enemy," one may almost reproduce in imagination such scenes of ordination as Timothy's (I Tim 4:13–16) with its exhortations from the elders to "endure hardship," to cultivate "the gift that is in thee," to rebuke the false teachers, and in the end, if need be, to emulate the fortitude of those who like the Lord and his apostles had given their blood in faithful "witness." Looked at in the light of such scenes the "readings, exhortation, and teaching" of this Book of the Itinerant Gospeller have a touch of the sublime.

CHAPTER XIV

THE THIRD BOOK OF MT

As before, the purpose and structure of Mt's Third Book are determined by its Discourse, which in this case is taken as a whole from Mk 3:20–4:34, and naturally reproduces the theme of Mk, viz., the Formation of the Spiritual Israel, a group set in contrast with Jesus' kindred according to the flesh.

Mk applies to this theme in common with all the New Testament writers the Isaian prediction quoted by Paul (Rom. 11:8) of the Deaf Ear and Blind Eye which the Servant (Israel) will turn to the prophet's message; but for his own special part he treats the teaching in parables as a purposed veiling of "the mystery of the kingdom" from "outsiders" so that only Jesus' true followers may understand the truth. Mt takes over and enlarges the Markan discourse in its framework, but he prefixes as his Narrative Introduction (Division A) an equivalent treatment of the same subject derived in the main from S^q.

The basic elements of this apologetic for Christians as the true "sons of God," are always the same: Israel, save for a remnant of the lowly, has turned a deaf ear to the divine invitation. But this was in accord with the divine intention; for the Scriptures testify that such would be the case with this "disobedient and gainsaying people." The theme is ancient. It is the classic plaint of the Wisdom of God that her saving message is rejected by the learned and prosperous and accepted only by the elect. In pagan literature it finds expression in the Prooemium of Heracleitus no less than in later philosophic or mystic complaints of men's dull ears; in the Prophets and late Jewish literature it becomes fairly stereotyped in passages such as II Chron. 36:15 f.; Jer. 25:3–7; Prov. 1:20–31. Particularly in the Wisdom lyrics of Ecclus. 24, Wisdom of Solomon *passim* and Bar. 3:9–4:4, Israel is praised as the people with whom rejected Wisdom has taken refuge, the people of divine revelation. Ps-Aristeas (139 f.) and Philo [1] make this the ground of Israel's claim to elective Sonship. Hence we cannot view it as an indication of dependence on Gospel literature when Paul in I Cor. 1:18–2:16 takes up the same

[1] *De conf. Ling.* 28. "Those who have real knowledge of the one Creator and Father of all things are rightly called 'Sons of God.' And even if we are not yet worthy to be called 'Sons of God,' we may deserve to be called children of his eternal 'image' the most holy 'Logos.'" *Cf.* with this Jn 1:12, 18; I Jn 3:1–3.

theme declaring the revelation of the mystery of God to have been made through the Spirit of Christ to "babes," to the confusion of the wisdom of the wise and the counsel of the scribes. Paul merely transfers to the humble group at Corinth the immemorial theme of the Revelation of the Mystery to Wisdom's children, a theme which Hellenistic and Jewish literature alike, but especially Jewish, apply as their doctrine of the "elect."

This theme I have endeavored to present in an article entitled "The Son as Organ of Revelation" in *HThR* IX, pp. 382–415 (Oct., 1916). It supplies the indispensable key to the versified Hymn of Wisdom in Mt 11:25–27 = Lk 10:21 f., a Jewish Wisdom lyric which is really central to both forms of the apologetic (*cf.* Mk 4:11 with various parallels). "The Son" who speaks in the poem is Israel, to whom the world must look as the elect hierophant of the mysteries of God. It is placed in the mouth of Jesus by S, to whom Jesus is the true incarnation of this redemptive "Wisdom of God." The actual source from which the two stanzas are derived by S^q has disappeared, like that of the similar extract in Mt 23:34 f. = Lk 11:49 f. quoted from "the wisdom of God," that is, the books of the Sages,[2] but the contents are unmistakably Jewish. Israel speaks, the people despised of men but chosen of God for His redemptive message to the world:

I

I thank thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth,
Because thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding,
And didst reveal them unto babes.
Yea, Father, for such was thy divine decree.

II

All things were revealed to me by my Father,
And none hath acknowledged the Son save the Father,
Neither hath any known the Father save the Son,
And he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him.

In such hymns the oriental mystic is taught as a neophyte to give thanks for the divine revelation made known to the group of the "elect" who are "Wisdom's children," as Norden sets forth in his typical Hermetic "Thanksgiving." [3] The Jewish hymn-writer, adapting the theme to his conception of Israel as the "elect" Son of God, by whom the universal Father sends saving *gnosis* into the alienated world (*cf.* Is. 53:11; Ecclus. 24:30–34 and see above on Mt 5:9), rejoices in the elective "decree" (εὐδοκία) of the Lord

[2] As Clement of Rome, *ad Cor.* liii. quotes Prov. 1:23–33 under the title "All-virtuous Wisdom."

[3] *Agnostos Theos*, 1913, p. 293.

of all creatures, who from among all has adopted Israel to be his "son," whereof the proof is divine revelation (*cf.* Dt. 4:6–8, Philo, *ubi supra*, and *Pirqe Aboth* III, 19–23). Because thus endowed Israel is God's son in a unique sense, his "chosen" or "beloved" son, alone possessed of the knowledge of God, or better having been known of him (Am. 3:2; *cf.* Gal. 4:9; I Cor. 13:12). This *gnosis* of Jehovah's chosen son gives him his mission to the world as a nation of priests to "sprinkle many nations" and bring them into knowledge of the true God. By his "knowledge" the righteous Servant-Son, in spite of his humiliation and suffering, will "justify many." The poem stands in the same line of succession to Deutero-Isaiah as the (perhaps contemporary) Wisdom of Solomon. S has appreciatively laid claim to it as voicing the true spirit of Christianity, which in the teaching of Jesus carries out this ideal (12:17–21). Either S, or more probably R^{mt}, in supplementing the quotation, embodies further the Invitation from Ecclus. 51 called the Prayer of Jesus son of Sirach, a song of Israel as divine hierophant to the nations.[4]

This Isaian theme, developed as we have seen by the Sages, forms the core and kernel of the parallel agglutinations of Mk and S. We shall see presently how these two build up (not wholly independently, since Mk shows knowledge of S^q, but with divergent aims) their apologetic for the Christian brotherhood, the spiritual kindred of Jesus, as the true heirs of this divine commission to the world. But it is important first of all to realize that neither S nor Mk is original in this appropriation to Christianity of the doctrine of the "Hiding of the Mystery" in order that the "Son" may be its hierophant to the world. Not even Paul, who repeatedly employs the thought (Rom. 16:25 f.; I Cor. 2:6–16; Eph 3:9–11; Col. 1:26 f.), can be said to do more than take over a commonplace of post-Isaian Judaism.[5] Out of many pre-Christian illustrations we may take this from the *Assumptio Mosis* i. 12–14, where Moses as Mediator of the redemptive Covenant and author of the story of the Creation in Genesis, recalls to his successor Joshua this "revelation of the (cosmological) mystery":

[4] Norden, *Agn. Theos*, p. 345 f., quotes Hierocles of the "Pythagoreans" as maintaining that "the wise man" is the only hierophant. Ps-Aristeas (139–140) makes the Egyptians themselves acknowledge that God appointed the Jews to this function. For the adaptation of the hymn by Mt and Lk (from S) see Easton on Lk (1926), p. 166 f.

[5] Bergmann (*Jüdische Apologetik*, p. 61) quotes *Num. R.* 14 and *Pesikta R.* 5 where Hos. 8:12 ("If I had *written* all my precepts") is used to show that the *oral* law is still a revelation belonging exclusively to Israel. The Gentiles (who have the written Torah) say: "We are Israel, we (too) are God's children." But the key to the mysteries is still retained in the oral tradition.

> God created the world on behalf of his own people. But he did not choose to reveal this beginning of the creation from the foundation of the world, in order that the Gentiles by their disputations about it might convict one another (of ignorance). Therefore he designed and devised me—for I was made ready before the foundation of the world—that I should be the mediator of his covenant.

When, therefore, Mk 4:11 gives as the reason for Jesus' teaching in parables the logion "To you (my spiritual kindred) it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of God, but to the outsiders all things take place in parables" he is not advancing anything new except the application of the figure of "hiding the mystery" to the teaching in parables. Indeed we can trace the logion not merely to several other Christian sources besides Mk and the full quotation of S^q, but to pre-Christian as well. Thus in an uncanonical "gospel" employed by Clement (*Strom.* V, x, 69) and in the Clementina (*Hom.* xix, 20) it takes the form "My mystery belongs to me and to the children of my household" and this in turn to Theodotion's rendering of Is. 24:16 "My mystery belongs to me and mine." [6]

Division A

The fact that Mk now departs from his usual rôle to report "sayings" rather than "doings of the Lord" compels Mt in combining Mt's parable chapter with S to reverse in some degree his usual method, drawing his narrative mainly from S^q. Thus in Book III Division A has a somewhat larger proportion of teaching material, due to its preponderance in S; only the two Sabbatarian Conflicts of Mk 2:23–3:6, left over from Book II, are drawn upon by Mt for his narrative. His material in 11:2–12:45 is therefore substantially S^q. Apart from the two Sabbatarian Conflicts we need except only a few verses of P material, where we must either assume that Lk has for some reason cancelled, or else ascribe them to R, whether by his own composition, or by drawing from N.

This great preponderance of S^q in Mt 11–12 is of untold value to the critic in determining the original nature of S, which can now be reproduced consecutively for several paragraphs. Its value is unfortunately diminished by the fact of rearrangement, undertaken by Mt as elsewhere in conformity to his pragmatic aim. In this case, as we have seen, his aim is mainly determined by the apologetic of Mk 3:20–4:34, but comparison with Lk will enable us in some measure to hold in check Mt's propensity for pragmatic rearrangement and determine in broad outline the structure and lesson of S.

[6] Theodotion is adopting the current rabbinic rendering; *cf. Sanhedrin* 94:1: "A *bath qol* resounded saying 'My secret is mine. My secret is mine.' The prophet answered, How long? He answered, 'Robbers rob,'" etc., Is. 24:16.

In comparing the Q element of Mt 11–12 with its Lukan form we are struck by the fact that both evangelists make a common beginning with the Question of John's Disciples (Mt 11:2–6 = Lk 7:18–23), though Lk has prefaced this with two illustrative anecdotes, one of Q material, the other P^{lk} (L?). Both continue this opening by a discourse of Jesus denouncing the deafness of Israel to John's message and to his own as well (Mt 11:7–19 = Lk 7:24–35). These two long paragraphs, uninterrupted on either side save by the interjection of extraneous logia by R^{mt} in verses 12–15 and by R^{lk} in verses 29 f., constitutes by far the longest consecutive block of S which has survived. We naturally look to this longest fragment of the Source to throw most light on its character.

Lk continues after the Rebuke of the Unreasonable Generation with a further anecdote illustrative of the grateful acceptance of the "glad tidings" on the part of the "publicans and sinners," perhaps from the same source (L?) as the Widow's Son at Nain. This story of the Penitent Harlot is equally appropriate to the context and almost equally hard to imagine as intentionally omitted by Mt. In 8:1–3 Lk has a substitute (Ministering Women, 8:1–3) for Mk's Spiritual Kin anecdote; the latter he transposes to the end of the Parable chapter (Lk 8:19–21 = Mk 3:31–35), doubtless deriving the substitute also from his L source. Thus he too makes up a group illustrative of the Spiritual Kin idea. He makes his motive clearly apparent by collocation, repeating significant clauses. Thus the discourse on Filial Righteousness ends with a parable contrasting the fate of "Everyone that cometh unto me and *heareth my words and doeth them*" with the fate of one "that *heareth and doeth not.*" Next comes the Believing Centurion, whose faith and obedience are contrasted with the unbelief of Israel (7:1–10) and the (supplemental) story of the Widow of Nain. The Denunciation of the Generation Deaf to God's Messengers (7:24–35) is followed by the story of the Penitent Harlot, whose grateful acceptance of the gospel of forgiveness is contrasted by a parable with the coldness of the Pharisee (7:36–50). As an introduction to the Parable of the Sower, addressed to those that "have ears to hear," we have, as above noted, a sort of substitute in Ministering Women (8:1–3) for the Markan Introduction, but Lk shows that he has not lost from view the key-thought in transposing the Spiritual Kin story; for he changes the wording of the logion to read "My mother and brethren are these that *hear the word of God and do it*" (Lk 8:4–21 = Mk 3:31–4:34). Thereafter, having switched on to the track of Mk, Lk continues to draw from this source alone for several chapters.

For the S^q complex beginning with the Question of John's Disciples, however, there can be little doubt that in Lk's mind the linking

pragmatic motive is a contrast of the lowly company of those that "hear the word of God and do it" with the Pharisaic people that have turned a deaf ear to God's messengers. In other words the Lukan motive in this entire "smaller Interpolation" is basically identical with that of Mk and Mt. The chief difference is the same as noted in connection with the discourse on Filial Righteousness: In Lk, as in Jas. 2:5, the *social* distinction of rich and poor largely takes the place of the *religious* distinction between Synagogue and Church. The latter comes to the fore in Mt. Lk's point of view is more like that of Paul in I Cor. 1:18–31. The L supplements expand the S^q context in this sense without altering the general motive.

If, now, with this basic unity of motive in mind, we turn back to Mt's arrangement of his Q material we find the story of the Believing Centurion, which so appropriately prefaces the discourse in Lk, already anticipated by Mt in 8:5–13. Critics are often disposed to claim as an indication of S^q connection the nearness on both sides to the discourse on Filial Righteousness. This may be correct. As we have seen, in Lk at least the key-clause linking the close of the sermon to the chapter following it, "Everyone that cometh unto me and heareth my words and doeth them," supports such a sequence. Proceeding with Mt 11:2 ff. we find nothing to break the coincidence in order of Mt and Lk save the slight editorial supplements above mentioned in Mt 11:12–15 and Lk 7:29 f. The uncertainty comes after the denunciation of the Generation Heedless of God's Messengers (Mt 11:7–19 = Lk 7:24–35). Here Lk switches to Mk for a series of chapters, Mt, on the contrary, continues the theme of the upbraiding of Israel for its resistance to the divine message. The "mighty works" which were the substance of Jesus' reply to the Question of John's Disciples now occupy all of Mt's attention, so much so that he even changes the wording of the closing verse from "Wisdom is justified by her children," as Lk logically reads, to "Wisdom is justified by her *works*." [7] He adds, thereupon, in verses 20–24 a paragraph denouncing the cities of Galilee "where most of his mighty works were done" attached by Lk *ad vocem* to the Charge to the Seventy after 10:12. The logion implies, of course, that these Galilean cities have had, and have rejected, their opportunity, so that the Lukan setting cannot be historical. On the other hand Mt's arrangement is no better; for if these verses are allowed to stand where Mt places them they imply that the whole complex, beginning with the Question of John's Disciples, was framed to stand at the very close of the Galilean ministry. Jesus looks back on a *completed* career of preaching and healing in Galilee. But as regards the structure and contents of S, it is scarcely imaginable that a source which

[7] Some texts correct to "children" to accord with Lk.

brought squarely to the front the question of the messianic calling of Jesus, and rested its proof on the "mighty works" should not have related in the preceding story at least some proportion of the phenomena referred to: "The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up and the poor have glad tidings proclaimed to them." To this we must recur, Mt's order is our present concern.

The paragraph on the Unbelieving Cities of Galilee is followed immediately in Mt by the logion on the Revelation of the Mystery to the Son, after which Mt takes the same course as Lk in switching to his Markan source (Mt 12:1–21).

The Q parallels between Mt and Lk are not resumed until, after Mt's extract of ten verses from Mk and Lk's of 18 from L plus more than 100 from Mk, we suddenly find the two transcribers of S again in coincidence at the end of Lk 10, where the Unbelieving Cities of Galilee meet us at Lk 10:13–15, and shortly after in 10:21 f. the Revelation of the Mystery to the Son. The inference is unavoidable that in S the order was substantially as in Mt 11, though Mt has not withheld his hand from the customary supplementation from other contexts in 11:12–15, and may have appended 11:28–30 from Ecclus. 51.

The question naturally arises for the analyst of sources whether the break occasioned in the S^q connection by the interjection on the part of both Mt and Lk of Markan material after the Woes on the Impenitent Cities, marks a real ending of the section in S, or whether the context continued. If we may rely at all on what I ventured to call in *BGS* the method of "pragmatic values" the answer to this question must be that in S the theme of "Hearing and Doing" the will of God as the note of true sonship really was continued; the Exorcism of the Dumb Devil (Mt 12:22 ff. = Lk 11:14 ff.) formed the narrative bridge to a denunciatory discourse against spiritual Deafness and Blindness whereof the element taken over by Mk was the parable of the Sower, or, as we might better call it, of the Receptive and Unreceptive Soils.

This parable, which survives to us only in the transcription of Mk, both Mt and Lk having here followed Mk in preference to S, is easily shown to be an erratic block in our second Gospel. This appears partly from its interrupted Interpretation (Mk 4:10, 13–20) where the hand of Mk is easily recognized in verses 11 f., partly from its position, which should be at the end of the day's discourses (verses 10, 13). Actually in Mk's arrangement the Interpretation has as its sequel: (a) a miscellaneous group of logia (verses 21–25); (b) two more parables apparently addressed to the same multitude as before in spite of their dispersal in verse 10 (verses 26–29 and 30–32); (c) a formal conclusion (verses 33 f.).

In addition the Interpretation, verses 10, 13–20, gives a totally different sense to the clause "asked him (about) the parables" in verse 10 from the sense given it in verses 11 f., where it is taken to mean "Why dost thou in teaching use parables (*sc.* "riddles," "enigmas")? The logion on "hiding the mystery" (verse 11) gives Mk his opportunity for bringing in his theory that the *use* of parables was such a "hiding." But in verses 13–20 the sense of the disciples' question is taken to be "asked him the *meaning* of the parable(s)." The parable of the Receptive and Unreceptive Soils is then explained in a sense which shows distinctly why it ends with the climactic cry "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear " (verse 9, repeated in verse 23). The Interpretation is indeed too much allegorized to emanate from Jesus himself, moreover it introduces allusions to "tribulation and persecution" which belong to the later time. But there is no reason why we should deny its derivation from S. Indeed there is very much to commend this.

As we have just seen, the real point of the parable, underscored by the pointed saying, "He that hath ears to hear let him hear," is the differentiation of the receptive from the unreceptive as the objects of Jesus' mission. This explains the Interpretation, which, while not strictly true to the intention of the parable in its application to various classes of Galilean hearers, is closely in line with the general theme of this section of S^q, and clearly accounts for the adaptation both in Mk and the parallels. The "good and honest ground" sure to yield fruit represents "Wisdom's children" by whom she is justified, or, as Lk has it, "they that hear the word of God and do it," the true kindred of Christ, a brotherhood of the "Israel of God." Thus Lk gives us, as usual, the true sequence, though his switching from S (or L) to Mk after 8:1–3 obscures the connection. He is also correct in breaking off after Mk 4:24 f., which he repeats from S^q in 19:26 = Mt 25:29. Mk adds this from the parable of the Entrusted Funds after the S^q conclusion (verse 23) to support his anti-Jewish application:

Mk 4:24 f.	Lk 8:18
He also said to them, Take heed to what ye hear;—with what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you, and more shall be added [8]—.	Take heed, therefore, how ye hear;
For whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that which he hath.	for whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that which he seemeth to have.

[8] Mk's additional logion from S is given by Lk in 6:38 = Mt 7:2. Mt's correction in omitting as duplicate the entire group of appended logia Mk 4:21–25 is best of all.

The two further parables which Mk appended at this point (Mk 4:26–29, 30–32) were recognized by Lk as forming no part of the original connection. The second of the two (the Mustard Seed) he gives along with its companion parable (the Leaven) from S in what may be taken as its true connection (Lk 13:18 f., 20 f. = Mt 13:31–33).

How, then, can we be sure that the grouping of Lk: Believing Centurion (7:1–10); [Raising of Widow's Son (11–17)]; Question of John's Disciples (18–23); Generation Deaf to God's Messengers (24–35); [Penitent Harlot (36–50)]; Ministering Women (8:1–3), represents in general the order of S?

The answer to this queston will be found by comparison of the grouping of Mk 3:20–4:34 with its two parallels. Both Mt and Lk introduce the Blasphemy of the Scribes from Jerusalem (Mk 3:22–27 = Mt 12:22–30 = Lk 11:14–23) by the Exorcism of a Dumb Devil, an anecdote enlarged upon in various contexts as symbolical of the dumbness (and blindness) of Israel, the dumb and blind Servant of Is. 42:18–20; *cf.* Mk 7:32–37; 8:22–26 and touches in 9:14–29 with Mt 9:32 f. and 12:22–24 = Lk 11:14 f. This forms in S^q (Mt 12:22 ff. = Lk 11:14 ff.) an appropriate beginning for the discourse on Spiritual Deafness and Blindness ("having eyes but seeing not, and ears but hearing not"), especially when expanded as in Mt 12:22–24 to include an Opening of Blind Eyes.[9] Accordingly it is followed in both Mt and Lk by the story of the wilful blindness and deafness of the scribes and Pharisees who seek to persuade the multitude that Jesus is in collusion with Beelzebub. Mt and Lk also agree in placing slightly later the Blessing on Seeing Eyes and Hearing Ears, Lk bringing this into direct connection with the Revelation to Sons of Mt 11:25–27:

Mt 13:16 ff.	Lk 10:22 f.
But blessed are your eyes for they see, and your ears because they hear. Verily I say unto you that many prophets and righteous men desired to see the things which ye see, and saw them not, and to hear the things which ye hear and heard them not.	And turning to the disciples privately he said: Blessed are the eyes which see what ye see. For verily I say unto you that many prophets and kings desired to see what ye see, and saw it not, and to hear the things which ye hear and heard them not.

The things seen and heard are of course the healings and glad tidings to the poor which Jesus made the burden of his answer to the Baptist. They are to believing eyes and ears tokens of the approaching kingdom of God.

[9] In compensation for an omission. The Opening of Blind Eyes (Mk 8:22–26) originally formed part of the S connection as shown in my article "Redaction of Mt 12" (*JBL*, XLVI), but was cancelled as a duplicate of Mk 10:46–52.

After 12:30 Mt digresses, led partly by Mk 3:28–30, which he blends with S^q, partly by his bitter anti-Pharisaism, which leads him to compose out of various S logia the denunciation of verses 33–37. But in verses 38–42 and 43–45 he is again drawing from S in coincidence with Lk 11:29–32, 24–26, though he has transposed the order of the two paragraphs.[10] For, as shown in my article "The Redaction of Mt 12" [11] we should follow the order of Lk 11:17–26. Israel is God's "dwelling" (*mishkan*) now purged of evil powers by His intervention. Either He must be received now to dwell among His people, or the evil powers will return with seven-fold virulence. Thus the S^q theme is still the "evil generation" which in spite of momentary awakening by the call to repentance of John has in the end turned a deaf ear to the Jonah-like summons of the prophet and a blind eye to the gracious works of healing of Jesus as well as a deaf ear to his winning words of the Wisdom of God. The same theme of Spiritual Blindness appears again in Mt 16:1–4 = Mk 8:11–13 = Lk 11:29; 12:54–56, for whose relation to the discourse we must refer the reader to the article above cited. Reasons are there given for the belief that a story of the Opening of Blind Eyes has been displaced from the connection, but the general trend of thought is unmistakable. The Exorcism of the Dumb Devil was made the starting point for a discourse on those who because they have hearing ears and seeing eyes are the true sons of the kingdom, Jesus' Spiritual Kin.

For this reason the Reproach of the Blind Generation (Mt 12:43–45 = Lk 11:24–26) is followed in S^q by the interruption of the woman who invokes a blessing on Jesus' mother (Lk 11:27 f.) and who is answered by the same logion on Spiritual Kin which in its Markan form (Mk 3:31–35) is introduced at the same point of the story by Mt 12:46–50. In other words Mt here switches to Mk, while Lk 11:14–36 continues to follow S, thus giving us the link of connection leading over to the parable of the Receptive and Unreceptive Soils in the S form. To make room for this Lk transposes its Markan parallel to the end of the parable.

Whether we should regard Lk 8:1–3 as part of L's addition to S and as supplementary to it, or as part of the original S is uncertain. The one thing which clearly appears is that all branches of transmission concur in their witness to a primitive grouping in which the central theme was: "They that have eyes to see and ears to hear are the true brotherhood of the sons of God. This evil and perverse generation, wilfully blind and deaf to God's messengers, is condemned in the judgment by the repentant Ninevites and the Queen of the

[10] Mt 12:38 is the response to the warning of verses 43–45.
[11] *JBL*, XLVI, 1/2, pp. 36–38.

South." Mk, therefore, who interjects the Blasphemy of the Scribes into the midst of his form of the logion on Spiritual Kin (Mk 3:22–30), and again in 4:11 f. throws in his version of the logion on Hiding the Mystery of the Kingdom, together with the quotation of the classic Isaian passage about Eyes that see not and Ears that hear not (Is. 6:9 f.), and who further attaches after the Interpretation of the Parable in 4:21–23, 24 f. a miscellaneous group of S^q logia about seeing and hearing the revelation, is not so far from the original S^q group as might at first appear. The basic theme everywhere is: "The Sons of the Kingdom, to whom the divine revelation is given, are they that hear the word of God and do it."

Our analysis of Division A of Mt's third Book has shown that from 11:1 to 12:45 it represents in the main a solid and nearly consecutive block of S, from which a few short sections have been slightly displaced, as in the anticipation of the Believing Centurion (8:5–10), the combination of the Opening of Blind Eyes with that of Deaf Ears in 12:22, and perhaps the slight postponement of the Blessing on Eyes and Ears that see and hear (13:16 f.). R^{mt} has also appended a few logia in 11:12–15 drawn from other S contexts, and perhaps expanded the Thanksgiving for the Revelation to Babes by adding from Ecclus. 51 the Invitation of the Wisdom of God. Also the change of "children" to "works" in 11:19 is surely his. Otherwise he takes chapter 11 from S practically as it stood.

In chapter 12 Mt has used more of Mk. Beginning with the two sabbatarian conflicts of Mk 2:23–3:6 and the attached description of the Multitude in Mk 3:7–12 he has added a rabbinic justification to the former sabbatarian conflict in 12:5–7, quoting Num. 28:9 f. and Hos. 6:6 together with his own adaptation of the logion 12:41 f., "Here is a greater matter (μεῖζον) than the temple," that is, human need. In the latter sabbatarian conflict he has interjected an argument from S^q (12:11 f. = Lk 14:5). Whether we may infer that Mk was drawing from the same source is doubtful, also the S connection. More important is Mt's addition of a borrowed proof-text to Mk's description of the Multitude in 12:18–21. As I have shown in my article "The Redaction of Mt 12" (*JBL*, XLVI, 1/2 (1927, pp. 27–29) [12] the quotation belonged originally to the story of the Baptismal Vocation. R^{mt} attaches it to Mk 3:12 to counteract the Markan theory of demonic recognition. He appends verse 21 from Is. 42:4c LXX to verses 18–20 which quote Is. 42:1–3 from the Hebrew text, and thus brings to a close his description of the nature of Jesus' work.

We must also recognize touches from R's pen in the Exorcism of the Dumb Devil, where he re-enforces by adding the opening of blind

[12] See also Appended Note V.

eyes as well as deaf ears, and by making the multitude cry "Can this be the Son of David?" We must further credit him with the composition of verses 31–37 from Markan and S^q material. Of this some had been used elsewhere while 36 f. may represent a rabbinic saying. He also transposes verses 38–42 with 43–45 and appends an explanatory clause to verse 45. Otherwise ch. 12 also is simply transcribed from S.

At this central point in the structure of Mt we may well pause to avail ourselves of the exceptional opportunity afforded by Division A of Book III for an appreciation of the nature and composition of S. The departure of Mk, Mt's primary source, from its usual practice of limitation to narrative in order to illustrate in a chapter of parables (Mk 4:1–34) its theory of the use of parable to hide the mystery of the kingdom from "outsiders," has led Mt also, in adopting the theory, to a departure from his own ordinary practice. He now resorts chiefly to S for his narrative introduction, a departure highly serviceable to the gospel critic bent on ascertaining as much as possible of the nature of this Second Source. Because of the change of rôle on Mk's part Mt correspondingly reverses his practice. S became his reliance for section A, while section B, the Discourse in Parables, was based almost exclusively on Mk. The result is a very large and almost unbroken block of Q material in Mt 11–12, whose general theme we have ascertained to be such as to account for all three dependent reproductions.

In Mt and Lk there can be no question that the group of anecdotes and discourses had at its beginning (with, or without, a preliminary story or two of healings productive of faith among the common people) the Question of John's Disciples, squarely presenting the issue of messiahship. The "works of the Christ" are here made the basis for Jesus' authority as God's Messenger to summon Israel to Repentance and to proclaim a gospel of deliverance from bondage, of healing and forgiveness of sin in view of the approaching kingdom. The claim is coarsened in Mk 1:40–2:22 into an assumption of personal authority on Jesus' part enforced by miracle. In S it is strictly in line with prophetic precedent. Jesus appeals to the mighty works *and* their reception on the part of the lowly as evidences not of his own greatness but of the present working of the Spirit (or "finger") of God, who through the agency of His messenger is thus evidencing the overthrow of Satan's control and the near approach of the divine dominion. On this point the contrast between Mk's use of the parable of the Strong Man Spoiled (Mk 3:23–27) with the S^q original (Mt 12:25–29 = Lk 11:17–22) is highly instructive. In S^q the parable reflects the promise of Is. 49:24 f.:

> Shall the prey be taken from the mighty, or his lawful captives be delivered? But thus saith Jehovah, Even the captives of the mighty shall be taken away, and the prey of the terrible shall be delivered; for I will contend with him that contendeth with thee, and I myself will save thy children.

Jesus is arguing from the overthrow of Satan's power that *God himself* has drawn near as the great Deliverer. In Mk the application is made to *Jesus* (3:28–30), so that interpreters generally assume that the "stronger," who delivers the captives, is Jesus instead of Jehovah. This difference in point of view is important; not merely as a proof of dependence on the side of Mk, but for the light shed on the Christology of S. All three witnesses agree, however, in making this second appeal to the "works of the Christ" continuous with the preceding appeal addressed to the disciples of John, the connecting link being the Denunciation of the Faithless Generation in Jesus' discourse about the Baptist (Mt 11:7–19 = Lk 7:24–35) and the incident of the Exorcism of the Dumb Devil.

"The works of the Christ" and their reception on the one side by the "evil and adulterous generation," which only sweeps and garnishes the dwelling of Jehovah but gives Him no entrance because blind to the real signs of His Coming, and on the other by the believing "little ones," is still the theme in Mt 12:38–45; and this connection is confirmed by Lk whether we follow his placing of the Woes on the Unrepentant Cities and the Revelation to Babes (Mt 11:20–27 = Lk 10:13–15, 21 f.) or that of Mt. We are still under control of the same theme after the interruption of the logion about Spiritual Kin, whether in its Markan form (Mk 3:31–35) or that of S (Lk 11:27 f.), and the same continues in the parable of Receptive and Unreceptive Soil (Mk 4:1–23) with its Interpretation (verses 10, 13–20) and appended logia (verses 21–23). The unbroken thread of common interest is: "They that hear the word of God and do it are the true elect, the brotherhood of Christ; to them are committed the oracles of God."

With the insight thus afforded into the controlling interest of S it becomes impossible to regard it as a mere disjointed collection of sayings. The impression we receive from the opening S^q sections descriptive of the Baptist's Mission and the Vocation and Temptation of the Christ, is confirmed by the long extracts made by Mt and Lk from that portion which affords a retrospect over Jesus' whole career of preaching and healing in Galilee. The question may still remain open in what sense, if any, the story of the Passion and Resurrection were covered. But after our survey of Division A the question is not open whether S was in any sense a "gospel." A writing which makes central the redemptive mission of Jesus, which brings squarely

before the reader the issue, "Art thou he that should come, or look we for another?", which defends Jesus' claim to authority as the ultimate Messenger of God by appeal to his "mighty works," congratulating those who hearken to the message as his true brethren in the revelation of the divine mysteries, and which condemns those who hearken not as spiritually deaf and blind, is certainly entitled to the name "gospel," a name which first appears in its pages (Mt 11:5=Lk 7:22). What better claim have the later compositions which build on Mk? Now we have seen reason to believe that the form of S was mainly that of a collection of agglutinated discourses, linked together by a relatively slender thread of narrative. But the narrative was there, and must have had an ending as well as a beginning.

The subject of the book was the redemptive career of Jesus. It included enough at least of such anecdotes as the Believing Centurion and the Exorcising of the Dumb Devil, to make its later references to Jesus' work of healing and exorcism sound reasonable, not leaving the reader open-mouthed before the question, What were these healings and exorcisms?, as we, alas, must stand at a loss before the reference to the mighty works done in "Chorazin."

No; S was not a *Spruchsammlung*. If it deserved no better than to be called a *Redesammlung* at least its ordering of its agglutinated discourses was not illogical nor inartistic. The drama which it covered was perhaps unduly limited to the ministry of preaching and healing in Galilee, but it was a real drama, whose climax is foreshadowed in the story of the Temptations: The Son of God who rejects the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them to win the victory of faith in the guidance of his Father. S was "a gospel."

Division B

In view of what has been already said of the Markan basis of Mt's Third Discourse and of the many evidences which have already come to light of his capacity for composition when occasion seems to him to call for it, we may deal very briefly with Division B. Its only Q element, save for the added parable of the Leaven, is the Blessing on Eyes that See (Mt 13:16 f.=Lk 10:23 f.), which we have endeavored above (p. 210) to place in its true connection. The remainder Mt transcribes from Mk, recasting in the case of the parable of the Patient Husbandman (13:24–30), or adds out of his mental "treasure."

The juxtaposition in Mt and Lk of the pair of parables Leaven and Mustard-seed (13:31 f., 33) indicates that both stood together in S. The fact that Mk draws from this source in his Mustard-seed parable is shown by the agreement of Mt with Lk against him in points of

phraseology: λάβων ἄνθρωπος (Mk om.), ἀγρῷ (Mt) = κῆπον (Lk), Mk τῆς γῆς, δένδρον (Mk om.), ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις (Mk ὑπὸ τὴν σκιάν). But it is not easy to say from what part of S the pair were derived. In Lk they are curiously isolated by the strange intervention of the Sabbatarian Conflict of 13:10–17, separating them from the eschatological group 12:35–13:9 whose appropriate conclusion they would otherwise form. On the other hand the Sabbatarian Conflict forms a pair with 14:1–6, and we have seen that obscure connections exist between these two L anecdotes and Mt's insertion (12:12 f.) into Mk's Sabbatarian Conflict (Mk 3:1–6 = Mt 12:9–14). The notable lack of connection in Lk is doubtless due to his combination of S with L. But the fact that Mk also (followed by Mt) brings in the Sabbatarian Conflicts of 2:23–3:6 just before the Slander of the Scribes from Jerusalem (3:22 ff.) suggests that these stories of healing and exorcism on the Sabbath preceded the group on Revelation of the Mystery to Babes. The relation of Mt to the group seems to be remote and due only to L's dependence on S.

Apart from his indirect use of S by transcription from Mk, Mt's use of it in Division B is thus seen to be very meager. He is clearly aiming to make up a total of seven parables of the kingdom, all beginning with the formula: "The kingdom of heaven is like unto" and ending with his usual sanctions of reward and punishment "in the end of the world." Only the last of the group (the Drag-net, verses 47 f.) without the Matthean addition of verses 49 f., suggests the possibility of an S nucleus forming a pair with the Responsive and Unresponsive Soils (verses 3–9). Its placing at the end would be natural for Mt. The introduction before it of the pair Hid Treasure (verse 44) and Costly Pearl (verses 45 f.), recalls the evangelist's addition of the pair of "mighty works" to complete a total of ten in 9:27–34. Their insignificance bears witness to a paucity of material quite incompatible with the rich resources which would have been at his disposal had he had access to L. Whether Mt here drew upon Church or Synagogue tradition, or merely exercised his own faculty of composition it is quite hopeless, and perhaps equally needless, to enquire.

Per contra the great extension and full elaboration of the material bearing on the dangers of false teaching speak eloquently for Mt's date, environment, and special interest. After what has been already said in our General Introduction it is needless to particularize. $R^{mt's}$ recasting of Mk's parable of the Patient Husbandman (Mk 4:26–29; *cf.* Jas. 5:7 f.) to introduce the incongruous feature of the sower of tares has its parallel in his supplement to the parable of the Slighted Invitation (Mt 22:11–14). The motive is illustrated in the recasting of 7:13–23, the supplement 24:11 f., and the specially contrived

Interpretation artificially introduced in verses 36–43, whose phraseology is unmistakably Matthean.[13]

Thus the make-up of the Discourse in Parables, used by Mt as a closing pronouncement of doom on the unrepentant after the Galilean ministry, much as his final Discourse (chh. 23–25) pronounces doom on unrepentant Israel, reflects the lineaments of the compiler. R^{mt} need scarcely have added his eighth parable comparing the disciple who has fully apprehended the teaching to a "scribe made a disciple to the kingdom of heaven" in order to complete his self-portraiture. To this appendix in Mt 13:51 f. might well be applied the figure employed by Zahn of the curious item in Mk 14:51 f. It is "the artist's signature subscribed in an obscure corner of the canvas."

[13] For the two Scripture fulfilments introduced in verses 14 f. and 35 see Appended Note V.

CHAPTER XV

THE FOURTH BOOK OF MT

With the transition formula of 13:53 appears a marked difference in Mt's use of his two principal sources. As concisely expressed by McNeile "Mt returns to his Markan source, having left it (verse 34) at Mk 4:34. The intervening material (Mk 4:35–5:43) he had already used. From this point he follows Mk's order to the end."

The critic's task in tracing out the structural composition of the two remaining Books is in consequence much simplified. It is not that Q entirely disappears. A few logia are embodied in the discourse on Church Administration to which Book IV leads up, and the discourse on The Consummation (Chh. 23–25) to which Book V leads up is largely drawn from S. Neither can it be said that the fundamental plan of Discourses introduced by a Narrative Division is discontinued. The distinction is still observable, but it rests on Mk's previous use of the same general method. For the built up discourse of Mk 9:33–50 is certainly the basis of Mt 18:1–35 and bears the same relation to the preceding narrative. In the remainder of Mt, accordingly, even more than before, it is not really the structure and composition of Mt that we are studying, but only Mt's improvements on the structure and composition of Mk. In two respects these improvements have a bearing on the question of sources which we cannot overlook: (1) The connection of S (if any) with the Exile Section; (2) The supplements of Mt from other sources.

1. As soon as the Markan origin of Mt 13:53–17:23 is recognized the reason for the paucity of Q material in the section becomes apparent. It is not that Mt has no disposition to supplement from S, as he has constantly done before, but that the Exile Section of Mk had no representation in S as such. The same is probably true of the Perean Section. Hence Mt has nothing to add from S save an occasional touch which barely suffices to prove that the same incident Mk is narrating lay before him in another version and connection.[1]

In my *GM* (1925, pp. 162 ff.) I have shown that the Exile Section of Mk (6:56–8:26) is an inferential construction of our second evangelist. It is unhistorical, built up theoretically with a doctrinal purpose,

[1] Mt 17:19 f. = 17:6 is such a stray Q logion. It is impossible to determine the context to which it belonged in S until we first learn whence Mk derived his anecdote of the Epileptic Boy and why he placed it in 9:14–29. See *BGS ad loc.* The juxtaposition in Lk with Mt 18:21 f. suggests that it stood in this vicinity of S.

and largely composed from duplicate material. Because of its unhistorical character this section of Mk is cancelled by Lk, whose own account of the extension of the gospel to the Gentiles in his second "treatise" is far more in accord with fact. Mt appears no less conscious than Lk that Jesus always remained a "minister to the circumcision, that he might confirm the promises given unto the fathers" (Rom. 15:8); but Mt in transcribing Mk refuses to take the drastic method of cancellation adopted by Lk. Instead he retains the Exile Section, expunging only the few clauses which make it an "exile." Thus the central anecdote of the Syrophoenician (Mt "Canaanite"), which Lk eliminates together with the context, is retained by Mt with the dexterous turn that makes the woman come "out of those borders," *i.e.*, Phoenicia, or in Old Testament phrase the "borders of Tyre and Sidon." Mk, on the contrary, makes Jesus journey "from Tyre through Sidon" back to the Sea of Gennesaret "up the midst of the borders of Decapolis." By means of slight changes such as this Mt is able to conserve the materials used by Mk in the Exile Section without sacrificing his particularistic principle laid down in 10:5 f. In fact he even takes pains to repeat it in this connection (15:24) in order that it may be perfectly clear that the principle is not violated, but that the believing suppliant stands in exactly the same relation to unbelieving Israel as the Believing Centurion of 8:5–13.

Of course there could be no objection even from the Synagogue's point of view to the welcoming of a humble, believing proselyte. The difficulty with the Markan context was that the preliminary to Jesus' journey into "the borders of Tyre and Sidon" was a Conflict with the Scribes, in which Jesus abolished the Mosaic distinction of clean and unclean meats (Mk 7:1–23). This conflict over ceremonial cleanness was the great issue of the apostolic age; not so much with any idea of imposing Mosaic ceremonial distinctions on Gentile converts—an impracticable demand of the Judaizers almost immediately rejected (Gal. 2:1–10)—as because of the difficulties created for *Jewish* converts anxious to conserve their ceremonial "cleanness" by the influx of Gentile converts to "eat with" them. Mk's Exile Section is concerned with this issue. It is indeed retained by Mt also in 15:1–20, but with another of his adroit corrections. Jesus in Mt 15:12–14 does not "make all meats clean," as in Mk. He merely abolishes the oral law of the scribes and their blind followers the Pharisees. This *mishnah* ("secondary" law) or δευτέρωσις of Hillel, as the Nazarenes designate it in Jerome's time, is a "planting" (in allusion to the designation "hedge of the Law") of which Jesus says (verse 13) "Every planting which my heavenly Father planted not, shall be rooted up." The addition 15:12–14, which includes the S^q logion verse 14 = Lk 6:39, shows clearly that Mt is

under no illusions as to the motive of the Exile Section. He only intends to neutralize Mk's radicalism so far as the essentials of Mosaism are concerned. For Mk is almost contemptuously anti-Jewish (Mk 7:3 f.), Mt is only anti-Pharisaic.

In a later supplement with which we shall have to deal presently it will be shown how Mt regards Peter as empowered to settle the delicate point of "binding and loosing" about which the controversy turned. For the present we merely observe that Mt retains the materials of Mk's Exile Section, cancelling only the Healings of the Dumb and Blind (Mk 7:31–37 and 8:22–26), though even in this case he makes compensations (9:27–34 = 12:22–24). His slight deviations from Mk throughout the section are full of significance in view of this intention, but are best followed in the Commentaries of Allen, Plummer, and McNeile.

To trace out from Mk's composite what he has derived from S in this Exile Section is a task belonging primarily to the documentary analysis of Mk. In my *GM* I have pointed to certain evidences in Mt 15:29–31 = Mk 7:31 f., 37 and Mt 16:1–4 = Mk 8:11–13 proving that Mt is not solely dependent here on Mk, but is acquainted also with the Source, which related both the Unstopping of Deaf Ears and the Opening of Blind Eyes, mentioning particularly the response of the common people to the heaven-sent gospel and its divine attestation in line with the prophecy of Is. 29:9–24.[2] This is not *another* S, but simply S *as utilized by* Mk. Mt is only plucking a few additional fragments not too obviously employed before from the original S. The β texts which add an independent parallel to Lk 12:54–56 in Mt 16:2–3 give further evidence of the survival of the Source independently of Mk, thus confirming our conjecture that in S an Opening of Blind Eyes formed part of the narrative which introduced the Denunciation of the Evil and Perverse Generation. In Jn 9·1–10:21 this exceptional "sign" is made the sole basis of the denunciation (9:39–41), though Jn returns to the Blasphemy in 10:19–21.

> There arose a division again among the Jews because of these words. And many of them said, He hath a demon and is mad; why listen ye to him? Others said, These are not the sayings of one possessed with a demon. Can a demon open the eyes of the blind?

The consecutive parallel between the Feeding of the Four Thousand followed by the Conflict with the Pharisees who demand a sign in Mk 8:1–10, 11–13, and the Feeding of the Five Thousand followed by the Conflict with the Scribes from Jerusalem in Mk 6:30–56; 7:1–23, is generally regarded as proof that Mk is here drawing from

[2] Quoted in Mk 7:6 f. = Mt 15:8 f. and turned by the Nazarenes against the Synagogue leaders (Jerome, *Comm. on Is., ad loc.*). See Appended Note VI.

overlapping sources. This is true. But Mk's duplications are not fortuitous but made with symbolic purpose. Mt's parallels show slightly more of the S basis, which seems to underlie Mk's second form (8:1–13), if not both. Unfortunately no certain indication remains to show whether the story of the Syrophoenician was drawn from this source or some other. The first group comes to a close at Mk 7:37 = Mt 15:31 (*cf.* Is. 29:23) after which Mk (followed by Mt) returns to make a new beginning based on his other source.[3]

Mk, as we have seen, takes advantage of this overlapping of his sources and of the expression found in one of them "borders of Tyre and Sidon" (that is, northern Galilee) to construct an out-and-out ministry among Gentiles prefaced by defiant abolition of the Mosaic ceremonial distinctions of "clean" and "unclean." Mt is certainly aware of the great exaggeration in this representation of Jesus' attitude toward the laws of ceremonial purity and toward Gentiles. He seems to be more or less suspicious also of the duplications involved in Mk's story. But he is unwilling to sacrifice so large a body of teaching material. The two miracles of healing the deaf-mute and the blind man he reluctantly sacrifices, discarding the characteristic full Markan development but retaining the substance elsewhere (9:27–34; *cf.* 12:22–24 and 15:30 f.). The remainder he conserves by careful adjustment to his own standards in 15:12–14, 21 f., 28 (*cf.* Acts 15:9), 31 (*cf.* Is. 29:23), 39; 16:6, 12. This carries him over the difficult ground of the Exile Section with a minimum sacrifice of Markan material. His doctrinal attitude on the cardinal issue, the adjustment of Jewish ceremonial purity to an influx of uncircumcised converts,[4] will appear more clearly from another group of divergences from Mk.

2. The task imposed on us by the peculiarities of composition of Book IV is not adequately met by the mere attempt to trace possible elements of S in the P material, nor even by the attempt to determine what changes from Mk may be due to Mt's independent acquaintance with S. The real problem is to read Mk 6–8 with Mt's eyes, that is, to observe what Mt takes to be its pragmatic values. The problem is not insoluble, nor are we limited in the attempt to solve it to those

[3] As shown in my *GM* the overlapping of sources in Mk continues over ch. 10. It would be of extreme interest if one of these could be proved the source of the Transfiguration vision (Mk 9:2–8 = Mt 17:1–8). But as far as indications go it is not the source from which Mk draws this Revelation to Peter which stands connected with Q, but its parallel in Mk 8:27–9:1.

[4] In the period of Mk and Mt the question of Mosaic observance as a requirement had long since sunk out of sight in all Greek-speaking churches. All that remained of the controversy was the question of "eating together" in the brotherhood repasts (*Agapae*). Some felt it needful to guard the scruples of the "clean" (so Lk), others "made all meats clean" (so Mk and Mt).

minute changes carefully noted by all critical commentators of which we have given examples above. Fortunately there exist in this fourth Book of Mt, devoted to the subject of Church Administration, *and in no other part of the Gospel*, a series of remarkable supplements which we designate "Petrine" because all are devoted to the support of the unique authority of Peter. This apostle is in fact presented successively as (1) first Confessor of the Resurrection Faith (14:28–33), (2) as Foundation of the Church and Arbiter of its Rules of Conduct (16:17–19), finally (3) as Vicar of Christ in the adjustment of the Church's relations to Synagogue and Roman State (17:24–27). These "Petrine Supplements" have been discussed in my article under this title in *The Expositor* for January, 1917 (Series VIII, No. 73, pp. 1–23), and are shown to have a very significant and important bearing on Mt's interpretation of the Markan story which he transcribes, as well as on the conditions and controversies of his time. A glance at their distribution and purport will be rewarding.

If we look at the two Divisions of Book IV, regarding the new beginning at 17:22 f. = Mk 9:30–32 as marking the transition from Narrative Introduction to the Discourse, it will be apparent that Mt looks upon the Feeding of the Five Thousand, prefaced by the Rejection in Nazareth, Hostility of Herod and Death of John (13:54–58; 14:1–12 = Mk 6:1–6, 14–29) and followed by the Conflict with the Scribes (15:1–20 = Mk 7:1–23) as forming (for teaching purposes) a unit. Evidences are ample in all four of the Gospels to prove that this story of the first *Agapé*, Jesus' farewell to his following in Galilee, was used everywhere as a sort of parallel to the Institution of the Eucharist at the final Passover in Jerusalem. To Mt, as to Mk, the group surely symbolized the formation of the primitive Brotherhood described in Acts 1–5. The scene as depicted in Mk 6:39–43 is unmistakably shaped to conform to the actual practice of the Church in these assemblies (often held in the open air) to break bread together, and after conclusion of the fraternal meal to "remember the Lord's death" in the eucharistic prayers. This is so generally acknowledged as to need no further comment.

It is also quite generally recognized that the night of storm on the lake which concludes the story, with the miracle of Jesus' coming to the despairing company of disciples in the boat, walking on the sea and subduing its rage, forms part of the lesson. Symbolic expression is thus given to the resurrection story, in which Jesus triumphs over the Power of Darkness and restores the broken faith of the Twelve. The latest of the symbolic developments of this theme in our Gospels, that of Jn 6, is in some respects the most instructive, because all disguise of the fact that it is the symbolism of the eucha-

ristic supper which is here employed is frankly abandoned, the fourth Gospel having no other account of the institution of the Supper.

The first of the "Petrine supplements" of Mt is attached to the climax of Mk's story of the Galilean Eucharist in Mt 14:28–33, and shows that our evangelist fully appreciates the symbolism of his predecessor. He brings it, however, into much closer parallelism with the story [obscured in all our gospel records, and only alluded to by Paul (I Cor. 15:5) and twice by Lk (22:31–34 and 24:34)] of *Peter's part* in the restoration of the faith of the Twelve. In reality the references just given show that it was just this soul-harrowing experience of Peter on which all hinged. Mk 14:27–31 tells (by Jesus' prediction) of the scattering of the Twelve and their rallying in Galilee. It also tells of Peter's refusal to believe the warning and of his volunteering to brave the storm of official hatred and go with Jesus "to prison and to death," an offer which Jesus receives only with renewed prediction of Peter's humiliating failure. Unquestionably the original ending of Mk must have told how this failure was retrieved. Jesus "appeared to Simon"; and Simon "when he was turned again," rallied his brethren (Lk 22:32). This was certainly the historic fact which turned the tide of faith for Christianity. But it has disappeared from the records, overwhelmed by the floods of controversy over the resurrection "body."

It surely is not valueless to come upon a reflection of this crisis of the faith, however symbolic in form, in the first of Mt's "Petrine supplements." For such we may esteem the added verses Mt 14:28–33 to be. The correspondence of Peter's offer to brave the storm with Jesus, his failure at the crucial test, the intervention of Jesus to restore his disciple's failing faith, the coming again to the despairing company in the boat, their acclamation as they see Jesus again in company with Peter, "Of a truth thou art the Son of God"—all this parallels too closely the facts as known from Paul and Lk not to be, as we have said, a reflection in the mirror of early symbolism of that lost item, the most important item of all, in the resurrection story, the "turning again" of Simon Peter.

But it is the reason for its introduction here by Mt which is our more immediate concern. Clearly Mt's purpose is to recall the supreme service to the Church of the first Witness to the resurrection. He takes the whole Markan story of the Feeding of the Five Thousand, together with its setting, at the same pragmatic valuation as all our evangelists. It is to Mt, as to all the rest, a kind of foreshadowing of the Founding of the Church. The addition which he makes, whatever its derivation,[5] aims to give Peter his due in this all-important event. Mt would have it remembered that the Church owed the

[5] The phraseology is (at least in part) Mt's own; *cf.* ὀλιγόπιστε, verse 31.

very beginnings of its resurrection faith, under Christ himself, to Peter, because he is about to appeal to the authority of Peter for the supreme decision of the Church in apostolic days.

We may pass over the fact that in the paragraph which next follows, prefacing the Exile Section of Mk with an account of Conflict with the "Pharisees and scribes" on "the tradition of the elders" (Mt 15:1–20=Mk 7:1–23), Mt's corrective addition in verses 12–14 introduces "Peter" (Mk "his disciples") as recipient of Jesus' explanation of the disputed saying. This belongs among the slighter editorial touches, and we are now concerned with more ample phenomena. For, while Mt takes over Mk's story of Jesus in "the borders of Tyre and Sidon," with the minor changes already touched upon, he does not fail to indicate by a second, still more striking "Petrine supplement," what he regards as the true application of the section.

Mt's editorial alterations of Mk 7:1–23, including his corrective supplement of verses 12–14, make it clear that he holds that Jesus abolished nothing but the "traditions of the elders" in his saying about inward purity (15:11=Mk 7:18 f.), leaving the Mosaic requirements unchanged. What, then, is the significance of the second "Petrine supplement" attached to the closing section of the group in 16:17–19? Peter is here exalted as the foundation Rock of the Church. But why is Jesus represented as solemnly conferring on him the "power of the keys" in the kingdom of heaven, with special authorization to "bind and loose"? The authority is that of a "Prince," or "President," of the college of scribes to declare a commandment obligatory or obsolete.

Previous reference in 5:19 shows that to Mt's mind alteration of the Mosaic requirement is among the prerogatives of the Christian teacher, however great the conservatism that should be applied. If we carefully observe the use Mt makes of Mk's story of the Feeding of the Four Thousand in its setting (slightly altered by Mt) good reason will appear to maintain that Mt approximates far more closely to the radicalism of Mk than we should expect from one whose conservatism and Jewish propensities have been made clearly evident heretofore. In a word Mt occupies the standpoint of the "Petrine" sections of First Acts on the critical issue of "distinctions of meats." He does *not* take the standpoint of Lk, who makes the compromise offered by James at the Apostolic Council the basis of settlement.

For, strange as it may seem, the settlement of the issue in the story of Peter's admission of Cornelius and his household to baptism in Acts 9:32–11:18 is far more sweeping than the "decrees" of the Council. For the Apostolic Council of Acts 15 is preceded by an Apostolic Conclave of Acts 11:1–18, this earlier conference having

been summoned to adjudicate upon the charge against Peter "Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised and didst eat with them." Here, in I Acts, Peter victoriously takes his stand on the divine *disavowal* of the entire system of Mosaic food-laws. God had showed him by special revelation that he "should not call any man common or unclean," because "God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is acceptable to Him." And not only are Gentiles thus freed from any concern about foods called "common or unclean" by the Jew, but *the Jew himself* is prepared by divine intervention to accept the hospitality of his Gentile fellow-believer *without any restriction whatever*. The ground for this release of the believing *Jew* from the distinctions of meats is specially noteworthy. It consists of a vision and voice from heaven, thrice related, the burden of which is that these distinctions of meats are *not of divine but of human origin*. "What *God* hath cleansed make not *thou* common." Identically this point of view is taken in Mt 15:13, where the same distinctions of meats are declared to be a "planting which my heavenly Father hath not planted," and which is destined to be "rooted up." Here as in Acts 10:1–11:18 the abolition of the Mosaic distinctions for *both* Jewish and Gentile believers is based on Peter's divinely given authority. But this is by no means the standpoint of Lk in Second Acts. In Acts 15, and 21:20–26, the unalterable necessity for Jews "among the Gentiles" of maintaining at all costs their ceremonial purity is fundamental. It is this assumed necessity which alone justifies James in proposing as ἐπαναγκές that Gentile believers should eliminate the "pollutions of idols" from brotherhood meetings as respects four sources of ceremonial contamination.[6] James' amendment to Peter's proposal remains the final solution for Lk. Antioch yielded to Jerusalem. *Mt does not.*

We are left confronting two alternatives: Either (1) Mt and the author of the Petrine tradition of Acts 9:32–11:18 allegorize the Old Testament, holding that the food-laws were always intended by God to be understood in a symbolic sense, the literal sense having been wrongly imposed upon them by human jealousy; or (2) they hold, each of them, to a doctrine of abolition, the doctrine that believers have been authorized by special divine revelation to declare the Mosaic distinctions obsolete, so that refusal to eat or associate with non-observers is reprehensible. The former is the Alexandrian view, adopted in circles of pre-christian Hellenism by Jews such as the author of Ps-Aristeas and taken over by Christians such as the author of Barnabas and Justin. In fact Barnabas even goes so

[6] "Fornication," banned by Paul on ethical grounds, was regarded by Jewish purists as a source of "uncleanness" not only to the guilty parties, but also to those "who eat and associate with them" (*Clem. Hom.* III, 68; *cf.* I Cor. 5:11).

far as to ascribe the Palestinian, or literal, interpretation to the malign influence of an "evil angel." The latter or abolition view is strictly Pauline, the view represented by Peter at Antioch *before his yielding to "those from James."*

It is possible, but not probable, that Mt and the Petrine writer of Acts 9:32–11:18 held to the Alexandrian view which made the literal application of the food-laws a human perversion never intended by the divine author. A different view is commended by the sharp distinction between human and divine in Acts 10:14 f. and Mt 15:13. This makes it probable that the community represented by these traditions *had never yielded* to the pressure from Jerusalem which was exerted at Antioch through the delegates "from James" (Gal. 2:11–13), a pressure which induced Peter to withdraw from his original attitude of freedom and accept the compromise. It appears that these "Petrine" circles of I Acts and Mt took the standpoint indicated by the utterance of Peter in Acts 15:9, "God, who knoweth the heart, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Spirit, even as he did unto us; and he made no distinction between us and them, *cleansing their hearts by faith.*" We may account for the Jacobean leanings of II Acts as we will, it is clear that neither the author of Acts 9:32–11:18 *nor Mt*, accepts the standpoint of Lk, that believing Jews are still under obligation to maintain their ceremonial purity, and must therefore make special provision to avoid contamination when "among the Gentiles." The two agree rather with Paul, to whom demands made on this ground, even tacitly, are *reprehensible; cf.* Gal. 2:15 ff. with Acts 10:14 f.

Historically the "decrees" of Acts 15 represent a futile attempt to enforce the Jerusalem compromise, an attempt foredoomed to failure, which by 93 A.D., when Rev. 2:14–20 was written, had already broken down in all its parts not supported by a real moral distinction, and which is visibly passing into the discard even at Antioch in *Didaché* vi. 3. Contrariwise Mt and Acts 9:32–11:18 represent the *liberal* Peter before the "hypocrisy" at Antioch, when (to Paul's disgust) he yielded to the awe-inspiring delegates "from James" (Gal. 2:12 f.). It is interesting to learn from Josephus (*Ant.* XX, ii.) that the issue had already been drawn in pre-Christian times *in Adiabene*. The Jew Ananias, who first converted Izates, king of the country, assured him that "the worship of God was of more importance than circumcision," and opposed that conformity to Jewish ritual which the king finally adopted under pressure from Eleazar, another Jewish propagandist of stricter views.

It is the "Petrine supplement" giving Peter authority to "bind and loose" for the Church which most clearly places us at the point of view of Mt in this part of the Exile Section, and enables us both to

appreciate the sense in which he takes the Markan group and also to see the motive of his changes. Mt softens the polemic of Mk against the Mosaic distinctions of clean and unclean, but he agrees to Mk's rejection of them as an unwarranted barrier to the spread of the gospel to believing Gentiles and the mixed "people of the land" (*ȧm haaretz*) of half-heathen Galilee and Decapolis. To Mt the "Canaanite" woman is as typical an example of the stranger adopted among the people of God as Rahab the Canaanite harlot and Ruth the Moabitess, whom he specially mentions in his genealogy of Christ. Along with the Believing Centurion, she is to Mt the type of many who are to come from East and West to "sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob" at the messianic feast (8:11).

But the special interest in her case is its (Markan) connection with the law of "clean" and "unclean," a law which Jesus elucidates in the preceding paragraph. Like Cornelius in the incident of Acts, the "Canaanite" is to Mt the shining example of the "alien" whose heart "God hath cleansed by faith" (*cf.* 5:8 and 15:19 ff., 28). She is not to be "called common or unclean." For this reason special stress is laid in Mt's version of the story on Jesus' refusal to depart from his particularistic rule of action until the vital condition (faith) has been unmistakably met. Another divergence in verse 28 defines exactly why the departure is allowable. Mt's changes in verses 22–24 and 28 are intended to meet two possible objections: (1) that Jesus had not been insistent enough in admitting none but those fully qualified, (2) that the woman's heart had not been unmistakably "cleansed by faith." In Mt's form of the story Jesus shows himself more sensitive than the Twelve to the limitation of his mission to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, but he brings out also more clearly the faith condition by adding, after the pattern of 9:22, "O woman, *great is thy faith*, be it unto thee as thou wilt."

Mt finds another opportunity to point the intended moral in his description of the multitude on the Decapolis side of the Sea of Galilee for whose benefit Jesus repeats the miracle of the Loaves. This follows in the next verses (Mt 15:29–31 = Mk 7:31–37), including special mention of the "blind and deaf-mute," though the specific cases of Mk 7:32–36 and 8:22–26 are here cancelled. Mk leaves it uncertain whether it is a Gentile multitude which is thus admitted to the blessings of the gospel here in heathen territory, or only certain wandering sheep of the flock of Abraham. The matter is indifferent to his radical anti-Judaism. Mt indicates by the addition from Is. 29:23 "They glorified *the God of Israel*" that he has in mind the "little ones in the midst" (Is. 29:23) whose previous connection with the Synagogue was at least dubious. This Galilean *ȧm haaretz* are Mt's equivalent for those "Jews which are among the Gentiles" for whose fidelity

to the Mosaic customs James in Acts 21:21 shows so much solicitude. The redactional addition, accordingly, has the same motive as verse 28. Jews or Gentiles, these "little ones in the midst" are admitted to the fellowship of the (second) *agapé* by virtue of their faith in "the God of Israel."[7]

The Markan group closes in Mt 16:5–12 with a transcript of the Q logion "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees," Lk 12:1, which Mk gave in the form "Leaven of the Pharisees and leaven of Herod" (Mk 8:15), perhaps misled by the alliance of Pharisees and Herodians under Agrippa I (42 A.D.) for the suppression of the Church.[8] Mt changes to "Pharisees and Sadducees," as in 3:7, and explains that "leaven" stands for "teaching." The original meaning and connection of the logion are obscure. In the connection Mt would seem to understand by "leaven" the fellowship of temple and Synagogue, which he contrasts with the Christian, the latter being an inward fellowship of the Spirit. In Q there is reason to believe we should understand the warning in the light of Acts 15:5.[9]

Once more in a sort of preface to the Discourse of this fourth Book Mt intervenes in 17:24–27 with another "Petrine supplement," whose interest again throws light on his understanding of Mk's grouping. The matter still concerns church administration, but now on its external side, its relation with the Synagogue on the one hand, the civil government on the other.

While the temple still stood brotherhoods of christianized Jews expelled from the Synagogue, or only tolerated in its precincts, might well be in some perplexity when the collector of the temple tax appeared demanding to know whether they counted themselves loyal Jews or not. They could avoid "stumbling" their Jewish brethren by consenting to bear the burden. On the other hand payment only strengthened the hands of their bitterest enemies. Moreover the issue was not solved but only complicated when, after the destruction of the temple, the Roman fiscus took its usual course of turning the tax, deprived of its original purpose, into the voracious imperial treasury. The tax-gatherer still challenged the Church with his annual question "Are you people Jews, or not?" To answer "Yes" was onerous and misleading, to answer "No" was to renounce a loyalty still cherished, if only in a sublimated sense. The midrash of the Coin in the Fish's Mouth was probably intended as

[7] In my *BGS*, pp. 83 and 96 attention is called to Mk's insistence on the different numbers 12 and 7 as corresponding to those of the twelve Apostles and seven Evangelists of Acts 6–8. It is possible that Mk intends thus to symbolize the two groups.

[8] See my article in *JBL* for Dec., 1920 (XXXIX, 102–120), "Pharisees and Herodians in Mk."

[9] See Appended Note IX.

pure haggadic fable when first related to a Christian "synagogue." To ears trained in rabbinic methods the question, "Did this actually happen?" is in such a case utterly *banal*. Surely no Jew of the period of the Tannaim ever asked the question whether the story of the pearl swallowed by the fish which ultimately fell into the hands of the deserving rabbi, was "a true story." Only the unpoetical western mind refuses to dissociate truth from fact. To the oriental, ancient or modern, Jew or Christian, this is easy. Symbolism is to him second nature. Hence the grotesqueness of the marvel has little bearing on the date, though it is true that the earliest Christian miracle stories show a pleasing contrast in this respect with the later apocryphal gospels. Also it is fallacious (*pace* Wellhausen) to argue for an early date from the treatment of the temple as still standing. This is habitual in both Jewish and Christian writers of post-apostolic times.[10] It is the temple-tax with which the haggadist is concerned, and that, as we have seen, had by no means fallen into desuetude. The story would be just as easy to date under Domitian or Trajan as under Claudius or Nero.

But its interest for us lies in the unique position given to Peter as vicar of Christ, standing as his representative to the authorities. Only in this fourth Book of Mt on Church Administration does Peter occupy any such position of primacy, and this (*pace* Grill and von Soden) has nothing whatever to do with the claims of Rome. For a Gospel which contains such directions as Mt 10:23 Rome has not even risen above the horizon. No; the "primacy of Peter" is a very real thing for Mt, but it is a primacy whose seat is Syrian. Nevertheless it admits no coloration such as Lk's from the primacy of James in Jerusalem. It is reflected vividly in the whole group of "Petrine supplements," of whose character and probable derivation we have now to take account.

Of the general character of the Petrine Supplements as Jewish *midrash* or *haggada* there can be no question. Reference has just been made to a parallel previously cited in connection with the parable of the Costly Pearl, which illustrates the nature of the story of the Coin in the Fish's Mouth. The parallel to Mt 16:17–19 adduced by Chase (after Schechter) in his article *s. v.* "Peter, First Epistle" in Hastings' *DB*, Vol. III, p. 795, wherein Jesus bestows on Peter his title of foundation Rock of the Church, has already been cited (above, p. 156).

In this supplement Peter as the Rock foundation of the Church forms an excellent companion piece to Abraham the hero of faith, founder of the ancient people of God. The promise that the Gates of Sheol shall not prevail against it is perhaps suggested by the deliver-

[10] See, *e.g.*, Clem. *ad Cor.* xl.

ance from the prison-house of Babylon promised to the captive seed of Abraham in Is. 45:2. At all events it alludes to the hope of resurrection first kindled by Peter's faith, which the Church looks forward to as a deliverance from Satanic bondage (*cf.* Rev. 1:18). But this addition to Mk's story of the Confession of Peter (Mk 8:29) betrays just the same late and midrashic character as its companion supplements. Moreover it can hardly be of Mt's own composition, for the inconsistency of the authority to "bind and loose" committed to Peter individually with that committed to the Church collectively in 18:18 is hardly less difficult to adjust than the inconsistency of Mt 10:5 f. with 28:19. As between the two commissions it could only be the rule of 18:18 which would survive to become the practice of the Church. Consequently we must regard 16:19 as encysted. And if we ask, Whence has Mt these rabbinic supplements? we can but point to the character of N as repeatedly defined. They are, as Streeter rightly points out, parasitic growths, whose relation to the main stock of gospel tradition (the Petrine of Mk) is that of the mistletoe to the oak. Their closest analogue is found in the edifying tales by which the targumists of the Synagogue interlard their renderings from the Hebrew Scriptures. We may look for their nearest affinities in the written targums of the Gospels in Aramaic, such as *Ev. Naz.* later came to be.

Division B

It has been shown in my *GM* (pp. 144 f.) that the discourse of Mk 9:33–50 is made up from two factors. In line with the course of the story, which places at this point the "leaving all" in Galilee to follow Jesus on the road to Calvary, we have

(1) A theme continuing that of the teaching at Caesarea Philippi, where Jesus reveals the doctrine of the cross (8:31–38), a theme continued in the series of anecdotes in 10:17–45, all of which relate to Renunciation and Reward. The burden of the group is: Leave all for the kingdom's sake. "He that would save his life shall lose it, but he that is ready to lose it for the kingdom's sake shall save it." This note of heroism and martyrdom pervades the major part of the material in Mk 9:30–10:45, including the eloquent paragraph (poetic in form as well as substance, and saturated with Isaian phraseology) on Sacrificing All, 9:43–48. As is well known, most of this paragraph appears twice in Mt (Mt 5:29 f.=18:8 f.). (2) Intermingled in strange combination with this primary theme appears a second theme on Receiving vs. Stumbling, a series of logia partly recurrent in Q (principally in the Lukan form) inculcating the duty of consideration for the weak. It is this second theme which is superimposed, and dominates the construction, in spite of its smaller bulk and looser relation to the story as a whole. For the introductory incident is the Dispute as to Who should be Greatest (verses 33–35); and although this seems to be only a briefer

version of 10:13–16, 35–45 it has doubtless been inserted at this point by the compiler of the Gospel for the sake of introducing the discourse in its present form. The theme of Receiving vs. Stumbling is continued by the Rebuke of Intolerance (verses 38–40) interjected between the two parts of the Q logion on Reward for Kindness to Christ's Messengers (Mk 9:37b, 41 = Mt 18:5 f. = Lk 10:40), and a briefer adaptation of another Q logion on Stumbling the Weak (Lk 17:1 f. = Mt 18:6 f.). The series ends with two Q logia on Saving Salt, attached in strange fashion at the close of the agglutination in a manner to bring attention back to the point of departure, viz., the Quarrel as to Who shall be Greatest (Mk 9:49 f.; *cf.* Lk 14:34 f. = Mt 5:13).

It is the second of the two interwoven themes of Mk which Mt has developed in expanding the discourse. His additions are chiefly from S^q, the most important being a group found together in Lk 17:1–4 but distributed by Mt according to his usual practice in 18:6 f., 15, and 21 f. The subject is determined by Mk 9:42–48, of which verse 42 rests on the same S logion, a warning against Stumbling the Weak, curiously joined by Mk to another logion related to it merely, it would seem, *ad vocem*, on members which cause "stumbling" (σκανδαλίζειν). Mt retains this sequel in spite of having already employed the logion in a different sense in 5:29 f.[11] His additions, whether from Q or P, are made with very slight exceptions [12] for the purpose of developing what we have shown to be Mk's secondary theme, one which bears a very close relation to Paul's plea for unity and toleration in Rom. 14:1–15:7 and in which the key phrases are "receiving" and "stumbling."

It is impossible to do justice to the noble development Mt has made of this theme in his Discourse on Church Administration, the culmination of his fourth Book, without some realization of the crucial problem of Church Unity to which Paul sacrificed his liberty and ul-

[11] The third metaphor, the offending "foot," is omitted, doubtless because Mt found it hard to conceive of an offending foot, paralleling the sense given to the offending (lustful) eye and the offending (itching) palm.

[12] On the Q insertion in Mt 18:3 f. see my *GM*, p. 144. Mk uses twice the incident of the Child in the Midst. In 9:33–37 it points the moral "Receive the little ones and forbid them not" (verse 37), an application suited only to the circumstances of 10:13–16, where the disciples have actually shown the "forbidding" temper. In 10:13–16 the same incident points the moral "Receive *the kingdom as* little children receive the supply of their needs from their parents," that is, trustfully, as a matter of love, not of merit. As in 12:25–37 Mt blends S^q and Mk, restoring in verses 3 f. the lesson of trustful dependence on divine grace. In verse 5 he returns to the Markan theme "Receive the little ones," but omits the incident of the Alien Exorcist, Mk 9:38 f., because contrary to his principle expressed in 7:15–23. Mk 9:37b and 40 f. are transferred to a different context. The confusion between the two themes, "Receive the Little Ones" and "Receive the Kingdom *as* Little Ones" is certainly due to Mk's adaptation of the incident of 10:13–16 to the lesson of his discourse on Receiving vs. Stumbling.

timately his life, and to the solution of which he bequeathed his interpretation of the principles of Jesus. Successively in S, in Mk, in Mt and in Jn we find our evangelists grouping together logia of Jesus having a bearing on this vital issue of their time; for while the profoundly Christian teaching of Paul regarding the question of "receiving" the weak and avoiding "stumbling," carried to the summit of effectiveness by his martyr journey to Jerusalem to heal the threatened disruption of the Church, had won the first battle of his great warfare for peace, the danger of schism was by no means overcome. The Jerusalem compromise advocated by Lk was short-lived. In 90–100 and down to Justin's time there were still considerable bodies of Jewish Christians in southern Syria who refused table fellowship to other Christians not observant like themselves of the Mosaic distinctions of meats. For those who, like the Nazarenes of northern Syria, approved the universalism of Paul, repudiating the food laws of Pharisaism as a "planting which the heavenly Father had not planted," it was a matter of vital concern to maintain that singleness of purpose which on the one side counts no sacrifice too costly for the kingdom's sake, and on the other is tolerant of everything except disloyalty in the brother for whom Christ died.

It is this problem of unity in the brotherhood which constituted in Paul's time and for more than a generation later the chief anxiety of the church administrator. For its solution in the spirit of Jesus it was necessary to insist on both poles of Pauline principle, unity of the Spirit, liberty of practice. The effort was to bring to the support of these principles transmitted "sayings of the Lord" calling for unreserved devotion in the essentials and equally for broadest toleration in non-essentials. It is not mere assonance but the blending of these two principles in such sayings as "If thy hand or foot cause thee to stumble, cut it off and cast it from thee" and "Whosoever shall cause one of these little ones to stumble it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck and he were cast into the sea" which has caused the intertwining in Mk and Mt of logia bearing on both aspects of the problem.

The Markan discourse begins with a lesson to church leaders on the spirit of Christian rulership which anticipates that of the next chapter (9:35 = 10:43 f.). It gives us in the words of Jesus an equivalent for Paul's first counsel to those who are "spiritual" (Gal. 6:1). By adding verse 37 Mk gives it special application to the question of "receiving." As we have seen Mt also makes this the beginning of his Discourse, only restoring it by additions from S^q to a more nearly authentic form (Mk 9:33–37 = Mt 18:1–5).

The second paragraph of Mk's agglutination further inculcated the lesson of "receiving" those who preach a different gospel (Mk

9:38–42), combining logia probably derived from S, but of uncertain context. Here Mt refuses to follow for the reason stated above. He cannot tolerate those who exorcise and do mighty works in the name of Christ, but are "workers of lawlessness" (7:22 f.). Lk adds a further incident (from L?) in which the spirit of intolerance manifested toward a Samaritan village by James and John is again rebuked by Jesus (Lk 9:51–56).

The last verse of the Markan group (9:42) is from S. This appears by Mt's addition to it of the S^q verse 18:7 = Lk 17:1 f. Clement of Rome may be using a pre-canonical source in citing this saying in his *ad Cor.* xlvi. 7 f, or he may be only quoting freely from memory. At all events he reflects the true meaning of the expression "little one" by rendering it "my elect." The "little ones" whose leading astray kindles the indignation of Jesus are not literal children, but the weak and ignorant or otherwise defenseless. The same applies also to verse 10 (P^{mt}), where the declaration that "their angels do always behold the face of my Father in heaven" is equivalent to saying "They may be friendless on earth, but just for this reason wrongs done to them are more immediately brought to the hearing of the heavenly Judge" (*cf.* Jas. 5:4). Access to the "face" or "presence" of God is granted at once to the advocates of those who have no earthly helper. Because of the close affinity of verse 10 with verses 6 f. it is tempting to ascribe it to S, accounting for its omission from Lk by the difficulty of making it intelligible to Gentile ears.

With or without this P supplement the S logia of the Markan group have a clearly defined common theme closely akin to the general teaching of the paragraph, viz., "receiving" the weak. Like Paul in Rom. 14:1–3, 13–15, Mk is pleading for toleration, particularly regarding "distinctions of meats" and things regarded as "unclean." The logia and incidents are chosen with special reference to the questions brought forward from the beginning of the Exile Section. Readers are to take earnest heed not to "forbid" (κωλύειν) the otherwise minded and the little ones, and not to "cast a stumbling block in a brother's way." Some critics refuse to see direct Pauline influence in this theme of Mk 9:30–42 superimposed upon that of the context. The coincidence of the teaching, including even the phraseology, can then only be accounted for by the falling back of both Paul and Mk on the same utterances of Jesus. In reality the logia are drawn by Mk himself from S, but the grouping is Mk's, and cannot be adequately dealt with apart from the structure of his whole Exile Section.

The third and final paragraph of Mk's discourse on church administration introduces an almost opposite sense of the term to "stumble." The warning to count no sacrifice too great which secures

entrance into the kingdom of God attached in Mk 9:43–48 uses the figure of the eye, hand, or foot "causing to stumble," and might seem to be attached at this point merely *ad vocem*. Its true connection must necessarily be with the group of which a trace remains in the logion on Tasteless Salt in verse 50; for the fuller, Lukan form (Lk 14:25–35) immediately precedes the parable of the Lost Sheep (Lk 15:1–7), which Mt introduces here in 18:12–14. The warning stands in line with those following the prediction of the cross at Caesarea Philippi, which are repeated in the sayings on leaving all of Mk 10. Renunciation is therefore the theme which represents the main stream of the narrative upon which the preceding logia on Receiving vs. Stumbling have been superimposed.

The form of the logion is unique in Mk showing the triadic symmetry observable in S^q but if derived by Mk from S we have no means of determining its original context beyond its logical affinity with the Q saying on Tasteless Salt (Mt 5:13 = Lk 14:25–35); for Mk seems to derive the warning on Readiness for the Cross from a kindred context (Mk 8:34 = Mt 16:24 = Lk 9:23). The Lukan connection makes it probable that the warning was to the individual, urging such unqualified devotion as is ready for any and every renunciation. Mk, in making it the nucleus for his discourse on Receiving vs. Stumbling may have given it a corporate application, offsetting his plea for toleration in non-essentials by a complementary demand for exclusion of all members (of the brotherhood) not thoroughly "salted." At least Mt makes no mistake in taking the entire group Mk 9:33–50 as the basis for his Discourse on Unity in the Brotherhood.

It is at the end of Mk's agglutination that Mt appends his principal supplements covering the remaining twenty-six verses of his Discourse. Their nature is self-explanatory, having to do with the duties of church administration with special emphasis on the recovery of wandering members of the flock, conciliation of disputes, and the exercise of that spirit of forgiveness toward brethren which is extended to all by the Father in heaven. Of the parable of the Lost Sheep (verses 12–14 = Lk 15:1–7) we have already spoken. The paragraph on Conciliation of Brethren (verses 15–22) expands the Q logion of Lk 17:3 f. by inserting from oral tradition a rule of church procedure (verses 15–17), a parallel to the Petrine Supplement on Binding and Loosing (verse 18 = 16:19), and a logion on the Hearing of United Prayer (verses 19 f.). The closing parable of the Unforgiving Debtor (verses 23–35) may probably be referred to R personally for reasons already explained.

It is interesting to observe that the *Ev. Naz.* contained the Q logion 18:21 f. = Lk 17:3 f. with an addition referring to Is. 6:5–7 as

proof that "matter (λόγος, *sermo*, = *dabar*) of sin was found even in the prophets after their anointing with the Holy Spirit." We also note the parallels to the third logion cited by McNeile from *Pirqe Aboth*, iii. 3, 9 and Grenfell-Hunt, *Oxyr. Pap.* i. 9. The saying has manifest relation to the rabbinic encouragement to Torah study: "Two that are sitting and occupied with the words of Torah, the Shekina is among them." *Cf.* 28:20 and Jn 14:13–17, and see Appended Note VII.

Thus the closing Discourse of Mt's fourth Book proves itself, like the two preceding, an expansion of Mk's of similar purport. Mt's additions and corrections, however, by their considerable employment of S^q prove that Mk was not the first to form agglutinations for similar purposes. In Lk 14:25–15:10 we have the fullest representation of a group, perhaps from L, which reveals the mind of Christ as respects the true basis of fellowship in the brotherhood, a devotion to the common cause as unsparing as his own. In the secondary group which Mk has interwoven with this as a fitting conclusion to his Exile Section we have another group centering upon the Q saying on Stumbling the Weak (Mt 18:6 f., 15, 21 f. = Lk 17:1–4). Authentic logia are quoted on the matter of intolerance and Pharisaic exclusiveness. There is some reason to believe this utterance stood connected in S with the saying "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees" (Mk 8:14 ff. = Mt 16:5 ff. = Lk 12:1). At least we may regard Acts 15:5 as revealing the real danger of Pharisaism to which the Church was exposed, and which Mk in his Exile Section and Mt in Book IV have endeavored in divergent ways to meet.

CHAPTER XVI

THE FIFTH BOOK OF MT

As in Book IV, and for similar reasons, Mt relies almost exclusively on Mk for his introductory narrative (Division A). On the other hand Mk is again duplicate, giving ground for the belief that his geographical setting for a Perean ministry, like that constructed for his Exile Section, had no foundation in S. So far as Q parallels are traceable they show connection with themes which in L appear as part of the farewell teachings at the final Supper of the New Covenant, allowing the surmise that such thread of narrative as S admitted led directly from the scenes of withdrawal from Galilee to those of the final tragedy in Jerusalem. As pointed out above (p. 116) the Markan setting of the Quarrel for Precedence, which S^q (Mt 19:28 = Lk 22:29) makes one of the scenes of the parting Supper, is so superior on psychological grounds that the inference of better Petrine tradition for Mk's narrative is surely warranted.

We cannot argue from this, however, an earlier date for Mk, or even independence of S, because S follows not a biographic but a gnomic method of construction, grouping incidents and sayings according to their pragmatic values. Tradition tells us indeed that the anecdotes of Mk were also lacking in proper biographic order, and this criticism offered by "the Elder" is fully borne out by the internal evidence. Nevertheless some attempt at biographic sequence is certainly made in Mk, and unless all value whatever is refused to the tradition of Petrine connections for this Gospel it must be expected that its order will frequently prove more historical than that of S. In reality not a few instances can be cited of such superiority of historical connection in Mk, nor is there any disposition on the part of critics to underrate the value of Mk's Petrine connections. We may therefore accept without hesitation the authenticity of the Q saying on Thrones in the New Jerusalem (Mt 19:28 = Lk 22:29) and the internal evidences of Lk 22:24–30 which indicate the Covenant Supper as the scene to which it was assigned in S, without abandoning our belief that the Markan setting is the more historical for the Quarrel as to Rank which in Lk 22:24–27 is made to precede it.

Critics are more likely to go astray in ascribing too great value to the historicity of Mk. His outline is indeed our best. At the high points of the drama, the beginning and end of the Galilean ministry, the new departure at Caesarea Philippi, the appeal to all Israel by

the purging of the temple at Jerusalem followed by the tragedy of Golgotha, it furnishes our one sure thread of Petrine connection. On the other hand the effort of Mk to furnish a historical outline is subordinate to considerations of practical edification and anti-Jewish apologetic, while in the body of material employed by him this predominance of the religious over the historical motive is still more marked. The grouping of anecdotes and the centering of each upon some logion of didactic value go to show that the stuff of which Mk was compounded is in fact what Papias' tradition declares, pulpit anecdotes (*haggada*) linked together for homiletic purposes.

We have found a striking example of Mk's effort to turn "sayings and doings" into biography (but biography still strongly influenced by religious and apologetic motives) in the Exile Section, a group which Mt adopts as the narrative foundation for his fourth Book. This section is intentionally cancelled by Lk and seems to owe its origin in Mk to a combination of two sources for a doctrinal purpose, much as Lk combines a Markan and an S^q Mission of the Disciples to make two Sendings, one of the Twelve, to Israel, the other of the Seventy, whose number suggests the traditional number of the nations of the world. Using two variants of the story of the Breaking of the Bread to the Multitude as nuclei Mk fills out the blank of the unknown period following Jesus' withdrawal from Galilee by a group of anecdotes, largely duplicates, applicable to the great issue of the apostolic age, the breaking down of the barrier of Mosaic particularism by abolition of the "distinctions of meats." He is followed in this by Mt (against Lk); for Mt moderates and corrects Mk's drastic anti-Judaism, but asserts more vigorously than Lk the principle of Pauline universalism on the basis of an authority committed to Peter.

It may well be doubted whether Mk has appreciably more in the way of reliable historic tradition on which to build his account of a Perean ministry than for his Exile Section. It is true that in this case Lk as well as Mt has followed suit. But Lk's Perean ministry is notoriously artificial, a mere jumble of stories, sayings and parables assembled under the theoretic framework of a journey whose stages are utterly without connection. The fourth Gospel knows only of a retirement from Jerusalem at Tabernacles to "Bethany beyond Jordan," the scene of the Baptist's earlier ministry, followed by residence until the fatal Passover at "a city called Ephraim" in central Samaria. According to Lk 9:51–56 and 17:11 the journey to Jerusalem was "along the borders of Galilee and Samaria" or "between Galilee and Samaria," and even the expression of Mk 10:1 "He cometh into the borders of Judea *and* beyond the Jordan" involves difficulties which must be left to the commentators to decide. Geo-

graphically this Markan journey presents problems no less perplexing than its predecessor to "the borders of Tyre and Sidon."

The material by which Mk has filled in this uncertain outline is equally suggestive of lack of information. There was of course the fact implied by the point of departure, a secret rally of Jesus' following in the neighborhood of Capernaum (Mk 9:30–33 = Mt 17:22 f.—reading *συστρεφομένων*) and the point of arrival, "Jericho," whence the ascent to Jerusalem begins. Otherwise it would seem that Jesus' whereabouts during the interval between his withdrawal from Galilee and the awaited Passover at Jerusalem were almost unknown. He was "on the borders" of Galilee where he could keep in touch with his Galilean following. He could also be traced somewhere along the Jordan valley route for pilgrims to the Passover, perhaps on both the east and west bank, but outside the jurisdiction of Antipas. Such material as Mk assigns to this period has no relation to conditions of time and place, but exhibits the closest relation to the evangelist's didactic purpose. It gives evidence of being borrowed in Mk, but whether from S, and if so in what connection, remains to be determined.

In my *GM* (p. 166 f.) it has been shown that Mk 10 continues the basic theme of 9:30–50 on Leaving All, repeating the incident of the Child in the Midst in a new application, and leading over to the theme of Rank and Reward in the Kingdom, a theme which appears in Q as part of the teaching at the Farewell Supper. Some of Mk's material, therefore, appeared in S, though in different setting. It was also noted in my *BG* that there are no stories of healings in the Perean Section save the two which frame it in, (1) the Healing of the Epileptic Boy (Mk 9:14–29), which Mk converts by touches in verses 17 and 25 into an Exorcism of a Dumb Demon, and which is clearly misplaced; (2) the Opening of Blind Eyes at Jericho (10:46–52). The development and placing (or misplacing) of this pair of healings correspond so closely to the development and placing of the pair of similar healings in the Exile Section (7:31–37 and 8:22–26) that the critic can but suspect that the location is due to Mk's desire to form an appropriate setting for the borrowed teaching material.

As regards his teaching motive Mk leaves small room for misapprehension. The basic theme is still, as above stated, Leaving All. It culminates in the answer of Jesus to the Ambitious Request of James and John in which he rebukes the spirit of self-seeking. This spirit is illustrated in the external and worldly conception of the kingdom still exhibited by the Twelve and rebuked by Jesus' own example of service and self-devotion (Mk 10:17–45). Such is the basic theme, which we have found paralleled in Q (Lk 22:24–30). But alongside of this, or perhaps we might say, superimposed upon it,

is a secondary motive of Mk's own, an anti-Jewish apologetic observable no less in the grouping than in the framework of symbolic healings, and most of all in the three editorial insertions at 8:31 f., 9:30–32, and 10:32–34. To Mk the Perean Section is an opportunity for showing how Jesus persistently rebuked and struggled against an unworthy, external conception of the kingdom and its rewards, a conception which Mk imputes to Judaism. In the mouth of blind Bartimaeus it is "the kingdom of our father David," in the minds of the Twelve it is a dumbness and blindness which still clings to them as an evil inheritance from their Jewish upbringing. It is the temptation of Satan (8:31–33; *cf.* 9:17 f., 22) which Jesus must uproot to inculcate the doctrine of the Cross.

The group of anecdotes affecting family relations in Mk 10:1–45 may well owe its original formation to that disruption of family ties which bulked so large among the trials of the apostolic Church (I Cor. 6), but Mk's grouping seems rather to reflect his anti-Jewish apologetic. "Pharisees" disputing about the Law of Divorce may seem as much out of place in "the borders of Judea beyond the Jordan" (10:1 f.) as "scribes" questioning with the disciples in the region of Caesarea Philippi (9:14 ff.); but that is nothing to the point for Mk. The Pharisees and their question about the Law are wanted to head the chapter because the series of anecdotes aims to set in contrast the religion of Law and the religion of Grace. In the law of the family the Pharisees look upon the precept of Moses as ultimate; Jesus finds a deeper principle in the instinct of monogamy implanted by the Creator. The logion also appears in Q (Mt 5:31 f. = Lk 16:18). Again the Pharisees are ever seeking new precepts to obey, aiming thus to accumulate the needful merit by which to secure the "eternal life" of the kingdom. The followers of Jesus look for eternal life as a gift from the Father in heaven, as children expect good gifts from parents, regardless of merit, conscious of ill desert, but in the humility of trust to the One who alone is "good." Mk has this comparison in two forms (Mk 9:36 f. = 10:13–16).

Nevertheless this loyalty of faith does not fall behind in good works. On the contrary it leads to a surrender of all to follow Jesus on his way to the Cross. The disciples themselves are still imbued with the Pharisaic notion that the rewards of the kingdom are achieved by merit. But not even leaving all to follow Christ gives title to "treasure in heaven." Peter is rebuked for so interpreting the promise in verses 23–31. The rule is simply Life through Death, not as in the scale of Pharisaism, so much for so much, but as in the spirit of the Crucified, sharing without limit in the present brotherhood of love, and hereafter in the life of the Infinite Giver.

Martyrdom itself entitles to no more. One may drink the cup of

the Son of Man by a partnership of his sufferings, assured indeed that those who thus share in his tribulations shall eat and drink with him at his table in his kingdom, but with no guarantee of prerogative. To sit on his right hand and his left in his glory is not his to give. It is for them for whom it is prepared.

Such is the pragmatic grouping of Mk 10:1–45, successive forms of contrast between the religion of Law and the religion of Grace; the religion of merit, won by obedience to written precept, and the religion of humble faith. The group constitutes Mk's Peraean Section and is bracketed between healings (symbolically applied) of the Exorcism of the Demon of Dumbness and the Opening of Blind Eyes. It is interlarded with repeated descriptions of the disciples' slowness to accept the doctrine of the Cross. The sequence is obviously more apt to have been dictated by pragmatic interest than historical information. At several points we seem to hear an echo of S, as where Mk 10:21 uses the phraseology of Mt 6:19 f. = Lk 12:33; but while Mk's material is here certainly borrowed, conjecture as to its source and original context would be out of place.

Our present problem is to read the group of anecdotes of Mk 10 with the eyes of Mt, a later compiler acquainted with S from which Mk had drawn, noting his changes and supplements, partly due to a somewhat different standpoint and environment, partly to his independent knowledge of the sources.

As respects change in point of view we have taken note in Chapter VI of Mt's alterations in the story of the Rich Enquirer, and have noted how the same story evoked further change and additions in Nazarene targuming with incapacity not unlike Mt's for grasping the real point of Mk's contrast. Mt's touches of the pen to remove deprecation on Jesus' part of the application to himself of the title "good," and to exonerate James and John from the charge of self-seeking at the expense of their mother, are familiar proofs of dependence on the side of Mt, but are of slight significance as compared with the change made in Jesus' answer to the question "What good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?" Mt's answer to this question differentiates his whole Gospel from Mk's. It is the answer of the neo-legalist: Keep the commandments of Moses, add to them the new commandment of Christ, and the life asked will be granted. This is complete neo-legalism. The requirement of unreserved surrender is to Mt a counsel of perfection. But Mk 10:21 preaches the gospel of the Q discourse on Abiding Wealth (Mt 6:19 f. = Lk 12:33) *as required of all;* Mt's "if thou wouldest be perfect" removes it to the sphere of a special class.

A P supplement attached by Mt to the Question of Divorce in verses 10–12 shows the same double standard. From its affinity with

the theme Leaving All one might be inclined to believe that Mt draws the saying on Eunuchs for the Kingdom's Sake from S. In that case its application was probably unlimited. The renunciation of home and family is at least part of the surrender contemplated in verses 27–29. Omission by Lk would be quite intelligible, but no decisive ground appears for ascribing the logion to S.

It is otherwise with verse 28, as already observed. The phraseology is wholly Mt's ("in the regeneration," "Son of Man sitting on the throne of glory"), but the promise is identical with that of Lk 22:28–30, and is indissolubly linked by its terminology (διατίθεμαι) with the "covenant" Supper. Jesus employs the figure of the "thrones of the house of David" in Ps. 122:5 in his assurance to those who have "endured with him in his trials" that they shall also share with him in the glory of the New Jerusalem. The promise is authenticated by the "faithful saying" of II Tim 2:11 f. In this latter passage essentially the same promise is embodied in a eucharistic hymn.

McNeile justly remarks that "The following parable (20:1–16, P^{mt}) has no bearing on the meaning (of the promise); the words 'first' and 'last' which led Mt to place it here, have a different force." In Chapter IX reasons have been given for ascribing the parable to S. Certainly its true application allies it with the Markan group to which Mt attaches it contrasting the religion of Law with the religion of Grace, but to what context of S this group belonged (if it be indeed drawn by Mk from S) one can only conjecture.

Western texts of Mt add after 20:28 "But do ye seek to increase from that which is little and to become less from that which is greater (*cf.* Jas. 1:9 f.), and follow up this supplement with an independent parallel to Lk 14:8–10. In meaning the addition stands closely in line with the context. Its source is not Lk, which uses other language. As in 16:2 f. the critic is left wondering whence the material was obtained. Uncanonical gospels were still in circulation in 100–150 A.D. from which such supplements could be derived. Did they find it in *Ev. Hebr.*? Had it been in *Ev. Naz.* we might expect to find traces of it in the Zion variants.

Such is the scanty series of additions attached by Mt to Mk's narrative in the Perean Section. Its few Q logia do not suffice to indicate any parallel section in S. Even if we add Professor Easton's strong evidences (*Comm.* on Lk, p. 275) for a non-Markan source in the third prediction of the Passion (Mk 10:32–34 = Mt 20:17–19 = Lk 18:31–34) no more can be inferred than that S (or L) had material leading over from the assumption of messiahship after the withdrawal from Galilee to the Appeal to Jerusalem. It is only with the Entry into the Temple that we come again upon a possible trace of S^q in its original context.

Mt adds at the end of Mk's description of the Triumphal Entry (Mk 11:1–11=Mt 21:1–9) an account of Jesus' welcome in the temple, healing of the blind and lame, and approval of the children's acclamation; and this description seems to be independent of the Markan account of the driving out of the money-changers and traders. At least verses 12 f., which describe this in the language of Mk 11:15–19, appear to be merely interjected from Mk after Mt's manner, while the remainder of the paragraph 21:10–17 tells quite a different story. We might regard this paragraph as merely one more of Mt's occasional embellishments of Markan narrative, especially as it serves to introduce one of his cherished Scripture fulfilments, but for the fact that Lk 19:39 f. also introduces at nearly the same point [1] a corresponding demand on the part of the Pharisees that Jesus rebuke the acclamation of his following, a demand which receives from him the answer, "If these were silent the stones would cry out." The language of the two reports differs widely, and the Lukan sequel describing Jesus' tears over the doomed city (Lk 19:41–44) has no parallel in Mt. But the coincidence of the Acclamation which Jesus refuses to rebuke is difficult to account for if there were no basis of common tradition. If this tradition be that of S this source contained an account of Jesus' reception at Jerusalem by acclaiming crowds after having healed "blind" and lame, an account which has been differently developed in L and in Mt's supplement. According to Mt 21:17 and Lk 21:37 Jesus "bivouacked" (ηὐλίσθη) with the Twelve near Bethany on the Mount of Olives. As McNeile observes, αὐλίζεσθαι does not "necessarily" mean that the night was spent in the open air, but the coincidence of Mt and Lk in the expression is a factor to be weighed in considering the question of a common source.

We have seen reason to believe that the closing discourse of S resembled in some respects the Farewell discourse of the fourth Gospel, and that its thread of connecting narrative passed almost without interruption from Galilee to the final tragedy in Jerusalem, having no Exile Section or Perean Section as such, though Mk may derive much of the material he has embodied in these sections from S discourses whose particular location in S we cannot trace. The salient points of Mk's outline for this period are the Purging of the Temple, and the Challenge from the Sanhedrin, with Jesus' reply showing his authority to be "from heaven" and their control a usurpation. The material by which Mk fills up the intervals before and after the Challenge of the Sanhedrin is incidental. It consists of the Withering of the Figtree with its attached group of stray logia (Mk 11:20–25)

[1] Not quite the same. Mt 21:15–17 should follow verse 9. Verse 14 is an editorial link.

and a group of Debates in the Temple with Pharisees, Sadducees, and Scribes. This leads over, past the parenthetic incident of the Widow's Mites, to the Warning against the Scribes and Doom-chapter. Nothing of this can be said to have necessary connection with the central drama. It is interesting, however, to observe that just the two scenes which *are* indispensable to it, the Encounter with "chief Priests and Scribes" in the temple and the Challenge from the Sanhedrin with Jesus' answer, do have Q parallels. The first of these, Jesus' Refusal to rebuke Acclamation (Mt 21:10 f., 14–17 = Lk 19:39 f.) we have already considered. The second is the Answer to the Challenge from the Sanhedrin. This is extended by Mt to include the parable of the Penitent Younger Son, a supplement whose closing verse consists of admitted Q material (Mt 21:32 = Lk 7:29 f.).

Is it reasonable to suppose that in this case Mt is reproducing S in its true connection? If so, the Markan allegory of the Usurping Husbandmen which closes the scene of Defiance of the Sanhedrin (Mk 12:1–12) had also a basis in S. Its material will have formed part of a group of Vineyard parables uttered in defense of Jesus' divinely given authority. He assumes leadership of those who had repented at the baptism of John and receives their support in his effort to make the Father's house again a "house of prayer" instead of "a den of thieves."

We have seen above that the parable of the Dissatisfied Wage-earners (Mt 20:1–16), another Vineyard parable, is certainly misplaced, and has claims to be regarded as derived from S. We have also suggested the possibility that the parable of the Penitent Younger Son of Lk 15:11–32, commonly called the "Prodigal" Son, is merely the L development of what Mt gives here (21:28–31) in its original S form. These are of course only possibilities, but apart from the weighing of possibilities progress cannot be made toward the solution of the problem of S. So far as they go they indicate that S also was not without a Jerusalem section.

Mt's motive for appending after Mk's allegorized parable of the Usurping Husbandmen the Q parable of the Slighted Invitation is not obscure. Mt has allegorized as well as Mk, completely rewriting the parable, as we have seen (above, p. 65 f.) Moreover his allegorizing supplements bring out the motive of the section more strongly than before. To Mt the parable foretells the doom of the city "that killeth the prophets and stoneth them that are sent unto her." It thus leads up appropriately to the denunciatory discourse. We cannot infer, however, that Mt's placing of the parable is nearer the original than that of Lk 14:15–24, shortly after the withdrawal from Galilee. Both settings are secondary, and both canonical evangelists display the same anxiety to forestall antinomian mis-

use of the parable, Mt by appending verses 11–14, Lk by attaching from L the logia 14:25–35.

The remainder of Mt's narrative introduction to his final Discourse is a simple transcription of Mk's Debates in the temple with Mt's customary abbreviations and simplifications of Mk. Whence Mk derives the group does not appear, though Wendt regards it as a continuation of Mk 2:1–3:6. If so it rests ultimately on S. It is noticeable that the incident of the Widow's Mites (introduced somewhat unexpectedly in Mk 12:41–44 = Lk 13:34 f. *à propos* of the charge that the scribes "devour widows' estates") fails to appear in Mt. This may be due to intentional cancellation, or it may be because Mt followed a text of Mk which was free from this interpolation from L. The latter view is favored by the exceptional affinities of the story with L. Among the linguistic data we note the use of *βίος* = "living"; *cf.* Lk 15:11.

Division B

The nucleus of Division B is the Markan Doom-chapter which builds on the foundation of a logion foretelling the Overthrow of the Temple (Mk 13:1 f. = Mt 24:1–3 = Lk 21:5–7). It forms a typical apocalypse consisting of a series of eschatological sayings of Jesus along with an early Christian "prophecy." The basic saying is unquestionably authentic, and clearly belongs to the Jerusalem period; though the situation carefully described by Mk differs slightly from that of Lk 19:41–44, where L elaborates the same utterance along similar lines of application ("thou knewest not the time of thy visitation"). Even in Jn 2:18–22, while the Purging of the Temple is transposed for special reasons to the beginning of the ministry, this prediction of its overthrow remains inseparable from it. Whether L be dependent upon Mk or no, only study of L itself can determine, and this belongs to the source-analysis of Lk. L was certainly dependent on S and almost certainly unknown to Mt. This leaves the coincidence with Mt here unexplained save through S. Easton notes (p. 289) that "there is no compelling reason for dating this passage (of L) later than 70 A.D.," comparing Is. 29:3 for the phraseology, which affects 21:20 also. The question must here be left open. L has similar warnings attached to a Q logion and including the parable of the Barren Figtree in Lk 13:1–9.

The peculiarity of Mk is that he builds up his apocalypse to the four disciples of the Doom of Jerusalem on the foundation of this Warning, using the same situation (Jesus overlooks the city from the Mount of Olives) and combining S^q logia on Watchfulness for the Coming (Mk 13:28-37 = Mt 16:28 = Mk 9:1 = Lk 9:27; Mt 5:17 = Lk 16:17; Mt 25:13–15 = Lk 19:12 f.; Mt 24:42–51 = Lk 12:35–46;

17:26–35), with an apocalypse of 40 A.D. used by Paul in 50 A.D. To this he adds extracts from Daniel and Micah. It is the specific application of these warnings and prophecies first to the events of 40 A.D., afterwards (by adaptation) to those of 68–70 A.D., which determines the date of the Markan chapter as a whole (the logia of the Lord and the Christian apocalypse of 40 A.D. being encysted). The chapter as it stands is later than 70 A.D. To extricate and date the encysted S^q logia, and to determine the relation of these to L is a complicated task, for which the reader may be referred to my *GM*, pp. 79–134, and to Appended Note IV.

The question remains why the Lukan eschatology should be so singularly distributed. L, and apparently S also, placed the bulk of the S^q material embodied in the Markan Doom-chapter, together with the Woes on Scribes and Pharisees which led up to it, at the Departure from Galilee (Lk 11:37–54; 12:35–13:9). Another block of similar Q material closes Lk's Perean Section (Lk 17:20–18:8). It is clearly due to the influence of Mk and L that parts of this reappear in the Doom-chapter transcribed from Mk (Mk 13 = Lk 21). Mt is much more influenced by Mk toward the same collocation. Hence we can only account for the Galilean placing of so large a part of Lk's eschatology by his fidelity to S, whose order was predominantly gnomic, grouping material topically for homiletic and catechetic purposes. The *topical* distribution in Lk cannot be accounted for by any motives which appear to have actuated our third evangelist. Study of the Lukan order favors, therefore, the assumption of an intermediate document, the source L, which had already attempted (with or without knowledge of Mk) to place the S material in biographic order. Solution of the problem cannot be attained until comparison of Mk and L has determined the relation of these two sources to one another and their relation to S from which both draw. The careful analysis of Easton supplies the most important data for this further step.

Our study of the Doom-chapter in Mk and Mt has already been summarized (above, p. 67 f.) No occasion appears for introducing new factors into the problem such as the supposition of independent resort by Mt to the apocalypse of 40 A.D., or to L. Mt follows the same method as elsewhere. His adaptation of Mk 13:5–23 merely heightens the apocalyptic features, brings into closer correspondence with the Old Testament the fulfilment of Dan. 12:11, and sharpens the warning against the πλανή which will follow the Great Tribulation. For this adaptation of Mk he has S, the Old Testament, and his own knowledge of developments since the catastrophe of 70 A.D. Every change made in the Markan apocalypse can be completely accounted for on this basis. With the closing words "Lo, I have

foretold it to you" (24:25=Mk 13:23) Mt indicates his complete agreement with the Markan construction as a whole, merely supplementing the final paragraph on the Coming by a prefixed logion from S of which Mk had just given the substance (24:26–28=Lk17:23 f., 27=Mk 13:21–23).

Looking back on the events of the great war which had culminated in the siege of Jerusalem and the destruction of the temple, Mt sees in them a fulfilment of Jesus' vain warnings to repentance, foreshadowed by the utterances of Micah and Daniel. His alterations in the parable of the Slighted Invitation (above, p. 65 f.) reflect this conviction as clearly as those by which Mk had previously allegorized the Vineyard parable of the Usurping Husbandmen to which Mt appends it (Mk 12:1–12). Only for two purposes does Mt employ the bulk of the additional material supplied by S and O. Both are typical. (1) In chapter 23 Mt expands Mk's brief mention of Jesus' Warning against the scribes into seven Woes against the scribes and Pharisees; for to Mt the scribes and Pharisees are responsible for the whole catastrophe. He attaches accordingly at the end the quotation from "the wisdom of God" predicting the overthrow. (2) In 24:29–25:46 he expands Mk's comparatively meager moral application of the apocalypse by extending Mk's series of S^q logia on Watchfulness for the Coming (Mk 13:28–37). The warning becomes thus the most elaborate of all Mt's great Discourses. The student is confronted by two problems: (1) the employment of S and O exemplified in both sections. The data for this are perhaps best exhibited in translations of the text supplied with marginal indications of the sources such as our Part III affords, or in critical commentaries such as those of McNeile and Easton. He must consider (2) the motives reflected in this twofold development. To the latter interest we may limit the few words our special introduction to Book V permits.

The seven Woes on scribes and Pharisees of Mt 23:13–33 are brought to a close by a denunciation not drawn from the source but attached from Mt's own pen: [2]

> Fill up, then, the measure of your fathers' guilt. Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of Gehenna?

The Woes are preceded by a comparatively slight expansion of Mk 12:38–40, setting over against the (alleged) arrogance of the rabbi, the humility of the Christian teacher (καθηγητής). It closes with the logion of Mk 9:35=Lk 9:48; 14:11; 18:14, and embodies in verse 4 that of Lk 11:46, displaying thus the usual type of Matthean composition. The contrasted pictures cannot, of course, be taken as

[2] Note the use of 3:7=Lk 3:7 as in 12:34.

an impartial description of Synagogue rabbi and Christian catechist as they were in Mt's time. The bitter hatred evinced is itself a needed corrective to our judgment. Its chief service to the historian is its lurid reflection of the hostility between the opposing camps. This is one of the unfortunate, but characteristic notes of the environment. Its better side appears in the ideal presented, a truly Christian ideal of humility in leadership which has better reflection in the Discourse of Book IV on Church Administration.

The seven Woes of verses 13–31 form a free parallel to Lk 11:39–52, with rearrangement of the order and expansion in verses 15–22. Oral tradition has been at work here, as in the expansion of the Beatitudes. In particular the indictment of the scribes for juggling with the form of oaths (verses 16–22) recalls Mt's expansion of 5:34–36. Unfortunately this particular type of expansion is exceptionally easy where rival religious bodies live in close proximity. Like the similar denunciation of the scribes in the Galilean scene (Mt 12:31–37), where Lk places the group of Woes (Lk 11:42–52), these additions are more instructive to the historian than edifying to the believer.

We may be as grateful to Mt for restoring the connection between the two parts of the quotation from the "wisdom of God" which Lk has severed (Mt 23:34–39 = Lk 11:49–51; 13:34 f.) as to Lk for preserving the proof that it is an extract of the same type as that of Clement *ad Cor.* lvii. from Prov. 1:23–33; for Clement quotes this passage as from "all-virtuous wisdom." The meaning is, the words quoted are an utterance of the divine Spirit, source of all the virtues, in the writings of the sages.

It is not the literary taste of Mt, though that is considerable, which preserves this eloquent climax. The coincidence of Mt and Lk shows that it formed the close of the corresponding discourse in S, whether located as in Mt or as in Lk. This earliest known gospel source already looks back upon the complete rejection of the gospel message by Israel as a whole. Indeed it seems to assume that the penalty has already been inflicted, and counts this a fulfilment of the plaint of divine Wisdom grieving over her wayward people. But the glance of S is not merely backward. Wisdom's dwelling now is forsaken because her messengers were ever received only with stoning and martyrdom; but there is still a possibility of return if henceforth her messengers are received with blessing in the name of Jehovah:

> Lo, I send you prophets and sages and scribes.
> Some ye will kill and crucify,
> Scourging them in your synagogues,
> And persecuting them from city to city.

That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth,
From the blood of Abel the righteous
To the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias.[3]
Whom ye slew between temple and altar.
Yea, I say unto you, it shall be required of this generation.

Jerusalem, Jerusalem, that killest the prophets,
That stonest them that are sent unto thee,
How often would I have gathered thy children,
As a mother-bird gathers her nestlings under her wings!
And ye would not. Lo your house is left to you forsaken. For I tell you, ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye say: Blessed is he that comes in the name of Jehovah.

As a literal utterance of the Prophet of Nazareth the figure of the sheltering wings (*cf.* Is. 31:5; Ps. 91:4) would not be free from an element of the grotesque. In the mouth of the divine spirit of redeeming Wisdom yearning for the restoration of the wayward and disobedient people it reflects the most poetic and typical feeling of contemporary Jewish aspiration. It reflects no less admirably the spirit, the viewpoint, and the Christology of S: Jesus the incarnate, redemptive Wisdom of God. If we are right in regarding the line "Yea, I say unto you," etc., as added by the writer of S it suggests proximity to the great catastrophe. Another prose comment is attached at the close of the quotation.

The other supplement of Mt completes Mk's teaching of Watchfulness for the Coming with further extracts from S developed according to Mt's deepest interest and most consummate style. To call Mt "the most apocalyptic of the Gospels" is but one aspect of the truth. Mt is emphatically the product of his age, and it needs only the comparisons already given of contemporary Christian literature (above, p. 76) to appreciate the intensity of his appeal to that religious motive which for many centuries has been the Church's reliance to hold in check the inroads of moral lassitude and indifference. Successive ages respond to different motives, and our own has swung far away from that of reward and punishment at the divine tribunal. Higher motives, we may hope, will give sanction to the same Christian ethic in generations to come. But the time is not far past when the terrors of Mt's great picture of the Last Judgment held all Christendom in thrall.

The picture has proved its greatness by its effect. Detailed study of the parable of the Figtree with its two connected logia (Mk 13:28–32 = Mt 24:32 = 36 = Lk 21:29–33; *cf.* Mk 9:1 = Lk 9:27 = Mt 16:28,

[3] An error for "son of Jehoiada" (II Chron. 24:20 ff.). In Lk the patronymic does not appear. In *Ev. Naz.* it was corrected.

and Mk 13:31 = Mt 5:17 = Lk 16:17) will show that Mt at first merely follows Mk. He parallels the closing appeal of Mk 13:33–37 with the S^q material (otherwise placed) out of which it is constructed (Mt 25:13–15; 24:42 = Lk 12:38, 40; 19:12 f.; 21:34–36). He supplies in the Q logia depicting the Consummation and the Q parables of the Watching Householder and the Faithful and Unfaithful Servants the S^{mk} material from which Mk has drawn (24:37–51 = Lk 17:26–35; 12:39–46; *cf.* Mk 13:33, 35).

Finally, with increasing freedom, Mt developes the S^q parables of the servants who wait for their master's Return from the Wedding (25:1–13 = Lk 12:35 f.; 13:25) and the Entrusted Funds (25:14–30 = Lk 19:12–27), and closes all with his truly grandiose description of the Judgment in the Consummation (25:31–46). Even this closing free depiction of Mt's own conception of the last assize does not wholly lack an authentic nucleus. Its central theme is "Inasmuch as ye did it, or did it not, to these least, even my brethren" . . . an echo of the logion of 10:40–42. There is nothing here but fidelity to Jesus' message as Mt understands it; nor does he abuse the principle of freedom applied in Synagogue and Church alike to haggadic teaching. Here above all he avails himself of the evangelist's privilege of recording what Jesus "would have" said. But conception and phraseology alike reflect unmistakably the "converted rabbi" of 90–100 A.D.

CHAPTER XVII

THE EPILOGUE

The striking peculiarity of Mt's account of the Passion and Resurrection is its limitation to Mk and those fungoid developments on the stock of Markan tradition which we have grouped in the present volume under the designation N.

We may readily believe that in the pre-Markan period of accumulation of evangelic tradition writings appeared some of the earlier of which had no more of articulation than the Oxyrhynchus logia, others, later, taking on more and more of the form of topical discourses possibly linked together by a thread of narrative. It is probable that S^q represents a writing of this later type, not a mere *Spruchsammlung*, but a *Redesammlung* formally introduced by an account of the ministry of the Baptist and the Vocation and Temptation of Jesus and centering upon the demonstration of his claim to be "He that should come" by the character of his "mighty works" and "gospel to the poor"; and it is *conceivable* that such a composition should close without a mention of the culminating scenes of the drama. Serious objections cannot fail to suggest themselves to such a view, but seeing that it is the dominant critical view it must be conceivable. The idea is not admissible, however, that after the appearance and wide circulation of Mk, understood to represent the apostolic witness of Peter, any gospel constructed on such a plan as Mt's could leave the reader standing before the picture of the last Judgment, his ears still ringing to the echo of its words of doom upon rebellious Israel, and thus conclude with the great Discourse on the Consummation, leaving unmentioned the outcome of the drama. Mt, which began with an elaborate Preamble relating the miraculous birth and ancestry of the Saviour and his Epiphany to wise men from the East, would have been a sorely ill-balanced composition if it had not closed with an Epilogue telling of the Saviour's crucifixion by his own people, followed by resurrection through the power of God to bring knowledge of salvation to the world. The seventh and final section of the Gospel was therefore a "foregone conclusion"; but why, out of the great variety of accounts of these scenes of pre-eminent importance to the faith, does Mt so rigidly restrict himself to Mk?

For it is not even the original Mk that he reproduces. If any trace still survives of the original ending of Mk it is the ending (itself

mutilated) of *Ev. Petri*. The fact is obvious and widely admitted that neither Mt nor Lk has anything more than the truncated Mk of our oldest and most authoritative texts, ending abruptly at 16:8. Lk pieces this out with several mutually discordant anecdotes of Petrine tradition to produce a story centering geographically in Jerusalem, and this Lukan-Petrine tradition is followed in the so-called Longer Ending of Mk adopted in most of the later texts. The Shorter Ending of Mk, so-called, exhibited in very few Mss, paraphrases as follows Mt's meager attempt to bring the story to a close with mention of the resurrection appearance *in Galilee* and the apostolic Commission:

> And they (the women mentioned in Mk 16:1–8) briefly reported all the things commanded them to Peter and his company. And after these things Jesus himself appeared to them, and from the East even to the West sent forth by them the holy and incorruptible proclamation of eternal salvation.

From the point where Mk breaks off Mt offers little more than a parallel to this late and lame attempt to round off a mutilated stump. It is true that after the first attempt in Mt 28:8 to patch up the unfinished close Mt adds another in verses 9 f. to the same general effect. But this, though not by Mt's own hand, rests on the same Markan basis, showing equal lack of further knowledge. Verses 16–20 supply nothing definite beyond the general inferences which the Shorter Ending also draws from Mk's interrupted story, save the clause "but some doubted." This does indeed indicate knowledge of the currency of some anecdote of the type of Jn 20:24 f., but it gives no particulars. Thus, even when Mk fails, Mt refuses to leave the same narrow domain. He prefers a generalizing inference of the same type as those of the editorial Shorter Ending, to any excursion into the fields of outside story.

And this is not all. In my *BG*, pp. 225–238 and my *GM*, pp. 187–203, reasons were given for the conviction that an earlier form of the Markan tradition did not contain the sepulcher stories beginning at Mk 15:40, but passed, as Paul does, directly from the cross to the Appearance to Peter. Whatever element of truth may be disclosed in this attempt to go back by way of the fragment of *Ev. Petri* to an earlier stage of Markan tradition, and ultimately to Paul's report of the apostolic witness (I Cor. 15:1–11), one thing is undeniable. It is *our present Mk*, in its present mutilated condition, which forms the sole basis of Mt. Such apocryphal outgrowths as Mt adds here and there are formed upon the same stock.

This would be impossible in any gospel emanating from Jerusalem circles, or within the reach of influence from the Jerusalem church at any date before 135 A.D.[1] It is almost equally incredible in any gospel

[1] *Cf. Ev. Hebr.* in Appended Note VI.

originating within the same period in the near neighborhood of Antioch, which gives us the *Ev. Petri* and at least large factors of the Lukan tradition. Caesarea, Antioch, and the Pauline mission field are not the regions in which to look for legendary accounts of the Fate of Judas conflicting as Mt 27:3–10 does both with Acts 1:18–20 and with Papias' account derived from "the Elders"; nor for disputes with the Synagogue over Mk's story of the Burial (Mt 27:62–66; 28:11–15). In short the Epilogue belongs to a region where Mk in its present canonical form was basic and supremely authoritative. The church where Mt first circulated anonymously as "the" Gospel had drawn its earliest traditions from the West. Mk *in its present mutilated form* had come to them with quasi-canonical authority almost from the beginnings of their church life. To Mt Mk is *the* Gospel, which only needs supplementation from S.

The significance of the phenomena to which we have just adverted will not be fully appreciated until comparison is made with certain other types of gospel tradition, in particular the Petrine of Lk and the Jacobean of the *Ev. Hebr.* Both must be compared with the apostolic Resurrection gospel of I Cor. 15:1–11.

At least in its Lukan form, which has been found Antiochian in type, the Petrine resurrection gospel is committed to Jerusalem as the exclusive center of the beginnings of the Church, and this form of the story originally included the primary Manifestation to Peter. James comes into view in Acts only indirectly and at a later time, without any mention of the Manifestation "to James," although Paul authenticates this beyond possibility of doubt as a factor of importance only second to the experience of Peter in the founding of the Church (I Cor. 15:7). The Antiochian tradition thus gives a place to the Jacobean, but a place distinctly secondary.

In the *Ev. Hebr.*, a Gospel in the Greek language of not much later date than Mt, whose field of circulation was eastern Palestine down to the border of Egypt, the Manifestation to James is made primary. The resurrection scenes begin in Jerusalem, but it is probably in Galilee at the home of Jesus' mother and brethren that the risen Lord institutes the Resurrection Feast through the agency of James. In *Ev. Hebr.* the migration from Galilee to Jerusalem will have been under leadership not of Peter but of James.

Exclusive dependence on Mk for the entire Passion and Resurrection story is hardly credible where either the Petrine tradition of Lk-Acts or the Jacobean of *Ev. Hebr.* were dominant. Where, then, shall we place the origin of Mt?

The writing in which adjustment is attempted between the Markan tradition in its Matthean development and the Lukan is the large fragment of *Ev. Petr.*, a composite gospel of the early second century

of whose circulation in that century we are informed by Eusebius (*HE*, VI, xii.). Serapion, Bishop of Antioch in 190–203, a writer on the subject of the Gospel canon who also played a considerable part in the history of the Edessene church, permitted for a time the continued use of the *Ev. Petri* by the church in Rhossus in the northern border of his diocese, but ultimately forbade it on doctrinal grounds. Our fragment, covering the entire story of the Passion and Resurrection, is from a late copy found in Egypt, but the mixture of Aramaic and Greek forms in the fragment shows a provenance from the diocese of Serapion. Now in *Ev. Petri* some probable traces remain of the original ending of Mk, side by side with the substance of Mt 26–28. Unfortunately our fragment breaks off just at the point where the eleven disciples, who had remained in hiding in Jerusalem during the eight days of the fatal Passover, have returned "mourning and weeping" to Galilee; for no message from the women has reached them. The closing words of the fragment are,

> And I, Simon Peter, and Andrew my brother, taking our nets, went away to the sea. And there were with us Levi, the son of Alphaeus, whom the Lord . . .

The attempted harmony of *Ev. Petri*, combining Mt with a form of the Petrine tradition similar to Jn 21 and probably based on that of the lost ending of Mk, gives us a clew to the region where conflict between these two variant resurrection gospels had taken place not far from 100 A.D.

It is only in the references of Paul and Lk, giving no particulars, that we learn of the primary fact of the Church's history, the Manifestation to Peter. The "Petrine" supplements of Mt 14:28–31 and 16:17–19 probably contain indirect reflections of it; but Mt's Epilogue takes no interest whatever in the Manifestation to Peter. Even the faint trace contained in Mk's account of the angel's message through the women "Go, tell his disciples *and Peter*" (Mk 16:7) disappears in the Matthean transcript, which omits "and Peter" (Mt 28:7). In Mk, and now still more in Mt, the interest has swung completely away from the apostolic outline, occupied exclusively with the resurrection appearances, and remains centered upon the story of the Women at the Sepulcher, who report (in Mk *fail* to report) seeing a vision of angels and finding the tomb empty. Of this entire episode Paul seems to know nothing.

If our analysis of Mk be well founded it is the conflict of this tradition of the Empty Tomb with the older tradition of the Manifestation to Peter into which it has been inserted after Mk 15:40 which accounts for the loss of the original ending. For the bringing in of the Jerusalem shrine-story could only issue in a disruption of that Gospel

in its earlier form and finally to the loss of its most authentic Petrine element. In any case we no longer possess the most precious of all the records of the beginnings of the resurrection faith, the story of how Peter "turned again" and "stablished his brethren."

Fortunately we can turn to a record much older than any of our Gospels, and certified to by one who includes his own experience with the rest, in Paul's record of the apostolic witness ("whether it were I or they") briefly summarized in I Cor. 15:1–11. Here is to be found both a record of the controversy regarding the body, and of the common starting point of all the divergent traditions. It was the effort of these by an adoption of secondary reports such as that of the Empty Tomb to meet objections of the type referred to by Paul (I Cor. 15:35) to the doctrine of a resurrection "of the flesh." [2] But the various adaptations came into conflict with one another, as well as with the apostolic outline of the Appearances, and thus lost from sight the most indispensable and vital record of all.

Conspicuous among the rest for its departure from the primitive form to elaborate the secondary and controversial is our Gospel of Mt. Mk's departure from the apostolic type was fatal to its own unity. Mt made the matter worse. We need only compare his Epilogue first with Paul, afterwards with the Gospel whose story it transcribes and embellishes with apocryphal supplements, to appreciate the effects of a further step along this pathway of degeneracy. For its outcome is this: Criticism now confronts the world with the assurance that of the two primary gospel documents attesting the fundamental faith of the Church, the older, S, never had any account of the Passion and Resurrection; the other, Mk, once had one, but has lost it!

All forms of the Resurrection gospel must be derived originally from the same contemporary record, briefly summarized by Paul as the story told by all witnesses alike. It is absolutely limited to the "Manifestations." As presented in I Cor. 15:1–11 these fall into two groups, the first of which begins with the Appearance to Peter, the second with an Appearance to James. It will be noted that Paul's first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion was to become acquainted with Peter, whose "revelation" of the risen Christ he compares to his own in Gal. 2:8, and also with that of "James the Lord's brother" (Gal. 1:18 f.).

The scene of the first group of appearances, including at least that to Peter and that to "the Twelve" which immediately follows, can only have been Galilee; for the concurrent witness of Mk, Jn 21, and the *Ev. Petr.* quite outweighs the belated and harmonistic correction of Lk. Indeed it is only in Galilee that we can imagine the "scattered" flock to have reassembled so soon after the crucifixion. We may therefore identify with considerable confidence these first

[2] So in the so-called Apostles' Creed.

two appearances with the incidents anticipated in Jesus' prayer that Simon, "when he has turned again" will "stablish his brethren" (Lk 22:32). All the older and more reliable reports concur in representing the following as the course of events: (1) a soul-shaking overturn in the experience of Peter, (2) a sharing of this experience with "Peter's company" (οἱ περὶ Πέτρον). We may accordingly understand Paul to be referring to the same two closely related events which are also implied in the angel's message in Mk 16:7; for the angel differentiates between an appearance to Peter and another to his associates. There was a manifestation first, says Paul, "to Cephas, *afterwards* (ἔπειτα) to the Twelve" and this seems to be reflected in the symbolism of Mt 14:28–33. The risen Christ "appeared" to Simon; then, when Peter had rallied his former associates, including at least one not belonging to the original list (Matthias?) he "appeared to the Twelve."

The closing appearance of the first group "to above five hundred brethren at once," is necessarily still located in Galilee because of the impracticability of assembling such a number elsewhere. But it leads over to a different scene in Paul's comment, "of whom the greater part remain until now, but some are fallen asleep." For it has been acutely observed that Paul could not have known the mortality statistics of this body of "original disciples" (*cf.* Acts 21:16), even in so general a way as the comment implies, if they were still scattered in the villages and hamlets of Galilee. As Paul knew the 500 "original disciples" they were still a united body which can be no other than the Galilean mother church in Jerusalem, formed under the leadership of Peter (*cf.* Mt 16:17–19). We must therefore place a dividing line between this Petrine group and the series of appearances which follows the comment beginning with that "to James." The second series must have been preceded, or shortly followed by a migration of the brotherhood of Galilean believers, accompanied by "the mother of Jesus and his brethren" (Acts 1:14) to Jerusalem. Whether the Appearance to James was in Galilee (as seems to be implied in the *Ev. Hebr.* fragment) or in Jerusalem, Paul does not say. The occasion of the migration will have been the Pentecost following the tragic Passover, and the last stage of the journey at the "place of baptizing," may have been signalized by the adoption of a Christianized form of the Johannine rite of baptism, then, or shortly after, followed by the "outpouring of the Spirit."

The second group of appearances in Paul's summary begins, "Then he appeared to James; then to all the apostles." Whether by the latter term a larger body are meant than "the Twelve" is doubtful, but the parallelism suggests something like a new beginning after Peter's rallying of the Twelve and the 500. Apparently the new impetus was given by the accession of Jesus' mother and brethren

with James at their head. Certainly "James the Lord's brother" and the "apostles" later formed a group in the Jerusalem body distinct from "Peter's company" (οἱ περὶ Πέτρον).

Comparison of the fragment from the *Ev. Hebr.* will show that it deduces church institutions from "James the Just" as exclusively as Mk and its satellites from Peter. As in Acts 21:17 f. so also for *Ev. Hebr.* and the *Clementina* the official representatives of the Church are "James and the elders." It cannot well be doubted that this great mother church, which even down to the period of the *Clementina* (*c.* 200) placed James the Lord's brother in the position of "Bishop of bishops" and described Peter as making periodical reports to him of the results of his missionary journeys, had plenty of traditions of its own, more especially such as related the Appearance of the Risen Christ to James and Founding of the Church in the Resurrection Faith. Indeed if we are right in identifying the "traditions of the Elders" which Papias delighted to collect with those of "the successors (διαδόχοι) of the Apostles in Jerusalem," a considerable number of such "traditions" are actually in our possession through the care of Irenaeus. For although Irenaeus thinks of them as traditions of Ephesus their intrinsic character plainly marks them as Palestinian in derivation.

Only one of these Jerusalem traditions, however, bears any resemblance to the supplements made by Mt to Mk's story. This belongs to Jerusalem as inevitably as the Sepulcher tradition itself, and would circulate almost as widely. It is an unprintable legend of the Fate of Iscariot, connecting it as in Acts and Mt 27:3–10 with the region outside the wall of Jerusalem bearing the sinister name "Field of Blood." But Papias' form of this Jerusalem tradition is in irreconcilable conflict with Mt.

Mt's story of the Passion and Resurrection shows, therefore, no close affinity with the cycle of Jerusalem traditions, and very little with the *oral* traditions of Antioch and Caesarea. It traces the whole body of gospel tradition to a mission of the Twelve from Galilee *without any mention of Jerusalem* save as the city which slew the Lord and drove out his apostles. For a gospel reputed to emanate from the mother church in Jerusalem it is certainly extraordinary that one could not infer from it that James and the mother and brethren of Jesus ever changed their original attitude of unbelief, if not hostility (Mt 12:46–50; 13:53–58), nor that such a thing as a church in Jerusalem had ever existed!

Our analysis of the Epilogue of Mt involves two elements, Mk and N, blended as in Books IV and V. In the background, hidden behind its narrative development in L we may dimly discern the outline of

S, whose closing discourse (or discourses) of warning, comfort, promise, and apostolic commission seem to be remotely reflected in Jn 16:1–8 and less remotely in Q and L. We have sought to bring all these, together with such uncanonical fragments as survive, into line with the apostolic resurrection gospel of I Cor. 15:1–11 in the hope of forming an adequate idea of the transmission and development of the resurrection story. Mt's Epilogue exhibits this development in its latest canonical form.

We have seen that neither S nor L really lacked reference to that resurrection faith without whose expression no agglutination of the "sayings and doings of the Lord," whether gnomic or biographic in form, could hope to meet the need of the churches. Even a *Redesammlung* which began with such a forecast of the career of the Son of God as that depicted in the stories of the Baptism and the Temptation, and which made central a discourse condemning the chief cities of Jesus' activity because their inhabitants turned a deaf ear to his message and a blind eye to his "mighty works," could not end without some intimation as to whether "the Son of God" overcame this resistance or not. If S when employed by our Synoptic evangelists had already advanced thus far along the road toward biography, we should expect at least a conclusion showing that the career of "the Son of God" did not end in disaster but in victory. The expectation meets reasonable fulfilment in a form corresponding to the general structure of the work if we take Lk 22:14–38 to be L's development of a Farewell Discourse at the Supper before the Passover, part of which appears also in Mt 19:28 proving its S^q foundation.

It is true that the L references to martyrdom and reunion in the heavenly Jerusalem are only in the form of prediction. But to the reader familiar with the event the fulfilled prediction of Peter's collapse retrieved by the intervention of Jesus would give the highest incentive to infer fulfilment for the remainder. In the form of a Farewell Discourse before the fatal Passover S could embody all that the reader would require, whether of testimony to the fact of the resurrection, or of apostolic commission to proclaim it, to bring his series of discourses to an appropriate close. Our analysis of the sources gives sufficient proof that such a parting discourse and second mission of the Twelve were actually contained in S, but a dislocation has occurred by which their content has been thrown back to an earlier situation in the narrative. This is probably due to the effort of biographers, beginning with Mk, to bring the data into an order having better claim to be considered chronological. Using this demonstrable item of Q material as the nucleus for our conception of Mt's use of the closing section of Mk we may take account now of his modifications and supplements to the basic narrative, aiming to read Mk

14–16 with Mt's eyes, and observing what means he employs to adapt the story to his specific purposes.

Of the legend of Judas' Fate we have already taken account. It has not yet reached the low level of the tradition of the Elders quoted by Apollinaris of Laodicea from Papias, but tends already strongly toward it. For its "Scripture fulfilment" of Zech. 11:12 (wrongly ascribed to "Jeremiah") we must refer the reader to Appended Note V, and for critical discussion of the whole story and its probable origin to the excellent "Additional Note on 27:3–10" on pp. 408 ff. of McNeile's *Commentary*. *Ev. Naz.*, according to Jerome, corrected the blunder in verses 9 f.

A few touches in the transcript of Mk's story of the Passion are of interest because of their relation to early controversy. As we have seen, Apollinaris of Hierapolis was able to harmonize Mt 26:1 ff. with the chronology of Jn and Phrygian Quartodeciman practice by an exegesis satisfactory to himself and the leaders of the Asiatic churches. Its precise nature can only be conjectured. Mt as usual clings close to Mk, but at least avoids Mk's ambiguity by a full dating, specifying the high priesthood of "Caiaphas." For the issue involved we must refer to McNeile. The transfer of the clause "for the forgiveness of sins" from Mt's account of the Baptism of John (3:2) to the Institution of the Cup in 26:28 has also a certain relation to current polemic (*cf.* Jn 1:29–34). Again Mt appends a verse (26:25) to Mk's story of Jesus' Prediction of Betrayal (Mk 14:17–21) to make the application to Judas more specific. Lk 22:21–23 is the most general of all. The scene of the Arrest in Gethsemane (Mk 14:32–52), which Lk embellishes with the supplement of the Angelic Support and Sweat like Drops of Blood (22:43 f., β text), and a Healing of the wound inflicted by Peter's sword (22:51) has its analogous supplements responding to similar doctrinal difficulties but differently placed and wholly independent. In Mt 26:52–54 Jesus rebukes Peter's drawing of the sword, declaring that "ten legions of angels" would be at his disposal for the asking from his Father, but he refrains in order that "the Scriptures might be fulfilled." The enigmatic reference of Mk 14:51 f., intelligible only where Markan traditions were current, is omitted.

Apocryphal supplements are also attached to the Markan account of Jesus' Trial. In Mt 27:19 we have Pilate's Wife's Dream, and in verses 24 f. Pilate Washing his Hands of Jesus' Blood, the guilt of which the Jews take upon "ourselves and our children." The bitterly anti-Jewish animus of this and the stylistic relation of both to the communications by angels and dreams of the Preamble are apparent without further comment.

Of similar character and motive are the supplements to Mk's

story of the Crucifixion. To the statement that "the chief priests and scribes reviled Jesus" Mt 27:43 supplies the words employed, blending Ps. 22:9 with Sap. 2:13. To the statement that the veil of the temple was rent (Mk 15:38; *cf. Test. Levi* iv. 1) he adds that an earthquake took place opening the tombs, so that "many bodies of the buried saints were raised up, and coming forth from the tombs after his resurrection entered into the Holy City and appeared to many." *Ev. Naz.* had a further supplement about the collapse of the great lintel of the temple. Ignatius (*Magn.* ix.) considered the resurrected "saints" to mean the Old Testament prophets. Such supplements are certainly neither early nor authentic, but they indicate by their language (the buried "saints," Jerusalem "the Holy City"; *cf.* 4:5 and Rev. 11:2) the intensely Jewish character of the circles whence they come.

Still more apparent is this late and apocryphal character of Mt's supplements in those attached to Mk's story of the Empty Tomb. Controversy with the Synagogue has here advanced a stage beyond the Markan. There the reader stood at the point where the discovery and report of the women left no room for further question of the reality of the resurrection, which the promised Appearance in Galilee, now broken off, will undoubtedly have confirmed. Mt advances beyond this point. He takes cognizance of unforeseen objections raised by "the Jews" to Mk's account. The answer had been made "Jesus' disciples stole away the body by night in order to support the false belief they champion." To this opposing charge, based, we may note, not upon any knowledge either local or historical, the Christian apologist replies by a new affirmation. Removal of the body by stealth was impossible because the Jews were forewarned and had taken elaborate precautions in the shape of a Roman guard, sealing of the stone, etc. Reply: In that case the guard would have seen and reported the alleged miraculous occurrences. Countercharge: They were bribed not to. Final allegation: The report of these transactions is current among the Jews "unto this day."

This series of charges and countercharges stands avowedly for a period of indefinite length, during which Church and Synagogue have debated the question raised in Mk's story of the Empty Tomb. But the closing statement of the authentic Mk that the women "said nothing to any man, for they were afraid" is itself a defense of the late appearance of the story. It adopts the usual device of the apocalypses to account for the fact that the apostolic Resurrection gospel had not a word to say about a proof which if known must have been sooner appealed to. Mk's story of the Empty Sepulcher is now brought forward as a new and convincing proof not known to the apostolic generation. Mk relates it as a tradition of the Jerusalem

church in 75–80 A.D. How much longer time must be allowed for the exchange of charge and countercharge in Christian-Jewish polemic recorded in our Matthean supplement?

It is worth while to note that the controversy, besides being prolonged, is on both sides a controversy "on paper." There is no appeal on either side to contemporary situation, conditions or facts. Nothing exists as a basis except the story of Mk 15:40 ff. elaborated with new details, each of which matches an objection of the opponent. Just as passages from the Old Testament are debated back and forth in the Synagogue with apologetic and midrashic supplements, but no new facts, so the text of Mk—the truncated Mk—is debated with no resort to any outside source of tradition or information. The circle is closed. The horizon of Jew and Christian alike is bounded by the letter of Mk. This Gospel is already treated in the region concerned as a kind of Christian Holy Scripture.

Our survey of the Epilogue confirms abundantly the conclusions previously reached on broader grounds. Mt represents a late and degenerate type of Synoptic tradition, remote even from the more varied developments incorporated by Lk. Its own incorporations, so far as drawn from the same incomparable document S, have of course the same golden quality, though in actual extent the added material goes little beyond that included under Q. Its other incorporations are notably inferior. As respects S Mt's contribution is rather a matter of text and order, than of substance. It helps the critic to restore something of the outline of this precanonical source, but lacks the rich development of L. Nevertheless by the very fact of this deficiency Mt enables us in its occasional contacts to go behind L to the oldest source of all. It even supplies scanty but sufficient evidence to show that S did not leave the reader staggered by ignoring at its close the whole significance of the religious drama, but really embodied the religious values of the story in a final discourse whose scene was the Farewell Supper in the Upper Room. Considerations of literary form and practical use led to the accumulating in this Farewell Discourse of no small amount of material which Mk, no doubt with excellent historical reason, carried back to earlier situations. The Farewell Supper as described in L (Lk 22:14–38, β text) surely represents far more closely than the meager traces of Q material in Mt's Epilogue the actual ending of S. This ending in several respects resembled the Farewell Discourses of the Upper Room which in Jn replace the Synoptic Doom-chapter and Denunciation of the Scribes. Thus the witness of Mt is not so much an end in itself as an aid to the recognition and recovery elsewhere of a better source.

Few compositions afford a better application than Mt of the noble word of Paul concerning the message to the world wherewith he and

his fellow missionaries felt themselves entrusted: "We have this treasure in earthen vessels." As the age of the great missionaries and martyrs receded into the past the quality of the "earthen vessels" which contained the treasure became progressively inferior. Largely it has been our thankless task to point to these unavoidable evidences of degeneration. To the larger public gold is gold and clay clay. The discoveries of the archaeologist are valued accordingly in the public press. But to the archaeologist himself, and to the historian who follows him, this popular valuation is the climax of absurdity. Gold is mere gold. The museums already have specimens of it in abundance before which the crowd stands agape, though for the most part it merely duplicates what the investigator knew before. But pottery! the earthenware! This has a story to tell wholly unknown before. At the excavations the visitor will see the gold viewed with indifference, while shouts of delight greet the discovery of a potsherd to give longed-for evidences of history and date.

The Study of Mt offers a parallel. This late Gospel holds indeed a golden treasure, sacred, invaluable; but for the most part the treasure was known elsewhere and largely in better form. But it holds it in an earthen vessel. And this indeed, though none of the finest, tells the story of its age. It shows us the adaptation of the everlasting gospel to the post-apostolic age and environment, a story which to the historian makes the meaning of the treasure itself larger and richer than before.

PART III
TRANSLATION

MARGINAL SYMBOLS

M = material derived from Mk.
N = material derived from the Nazarene targum.
O = material derived from oral sources.
P = material peculiar to this Gospel.
Q = material belonging to the "double tradition."
R = material contributed by the Redactor.
S = material derived from the "Second Source."

In a few cases words and phrases apparently proverbial in character and derivation are enclosed in " ".

Marginal indications of secondary derivation are enclosed in ( ).

The left-hand margin is reserved for chapter and verse numbers, and paragraph divisions.

DIVISION AND MARKING OF THE TEXT

Paragraphs are divided according to the sense the evangelist seems to intend. The opening words of these sense-paragraphs are *set out* to the left of the column.

A 5-em dash is used to separate material drawn from different sources, or different contexts of the same source. Where the separation coincides with that of the sense-paragraphs the numeral only is set out and the opening words are *set in.*

Bold-face italics are used to indicate changes of wording or supplementation (except in cases of considerable length) by the evangelist (Redactor). His abbreviations and minor changes are left unmarked.

RENDERING

Translation has been made from the critical Greek text with preceding translations diligently revised and compared. Verses or clauses not found in the best manuscripts are omitted, their absence being marked by [ ]. The language of the older versions has been modernized, but no further than seemed desirable for the purpose of conveying the original tone and sense. Retention of the second person singular of the second personal pronoun seemed advisable for distinction from the second person plural. "Jehovah" is used for the Hebrew "Yahweh" following the American Revised Version.

Thanks are due especially to Professor James Moffatt for permission to employ in many instances his telling phraseology without accepting in other instances his conception of the sense.

PART III

TRANSLATION

THE PREAMBLE: CHH. 1-2

" Born of the seed of David according to the flesh, miraculously manifested to be the Son of God by the resurrection." Rom. 1:3 f.

i. The Genealogy of Jesus.

1:1. ***The pedigree of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham.*** R

2. Abraham was father to Isaac, Isaac was father to Jacob, Jacob was father to Judah (I Chron. 1–3 LXX)
3. and his brethren, Judah was father to Perez and Zerah ***by Tamar,*** Perez was father to
4. Hezron, Hezron was father to Aram, Aram was father to Aminadab, Aminadab was father to Nahshon, Nahshon was father to
5. Salmon, Salmon was father to Boaz ***by Rahab,*** Boaz was father to Obed ***by Ruth,***
6. Obed was father to Jesse and Jesse was father to David the king.

David was father to Solomon ***by the wife of***

7. ***Uriah,*** Solomon was father to Rehoboam, Rehoboam was father to Abijah, Abijah
8. was father to Asa, Asa was father to Jehoshaphat, Jehoshaphat was father to Joram,
9. Joram was father to Uzziah, Uzziah was father to Jotham, Jotham was father to
10. Ahaz, Ahaz was father to Hezekiah, Hezekiah was father to Manasseh, Manasseh was father to Amon, Amon was father to
11. Josiah and Josiah was father to Jechoniah and his brethren ***at the time of the migration to Babylon.***
12. ***And after the migration to Babylon*** Jechoniah was father to Shealtiel, Shealtiel was father to Zerubbabel, R (1 Chr. 3:17 LXX)
13. Zerubbabel was father to Abiud, Abiud was father to Eliakim, Eliakim was father to P (N?)
14. Azor, Azor was father to Zadok, Zadok was father to Achim, Achim was father to Eliud,
15. Eliud was father to Eleazar, Eleazar was father to Matthan, Matthan was father to

1:16. Jacob, Jacob was father to Joseph, and Joseph, *to whom the virgin Mary was betrothed,* was father to Jesus that is called Christ.

17. ***Thus all the generations from Abraham to David are fourteen generations, and from David to the migration to Babylon are fourteen generations, and from the migration to Babylon until the Christ fourteen generations.*** R

ii. His Miraculous Birth.

18. Now the birth of the Christ was after this manner. His mother Mary having been betrothed to Joseph, before they had come together, she was found to be with child P(O?)
19. by the holy Spirit. And Joseph her husband, being a kind man and unwilling to disgrace her, resolved to put her away
20. secretly. But after he had planned this lo, an angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take to thee Mary thy wife, for that which is begotten in her comes from
21. the holy Spirit. And she will bear a son and thou shalt call his name Jesus (Saviour), for
22. he will save his people from their sins. ***All this took place that the word of the Lord spoken through the prophet might be fulfilled:*** R
23. ***Behold the virgin will conceive and bear a son,***
And his name will be called Immanuel, (Is. 7:14 LXX)
24. ***which is in translation God is with us.*** So when he had risen from sleep Joseph did as the angel of the Lord had commanded
25. him and took his wife home; but he did not live with her as a husband until she had borne a son. And he gave him the name Jesus.

iii. Astrologers pay him Homage.

2:1. Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea in the days of Herod the king, lo, there came to Jerusalem from the East N
2. trologers, asking, Where is the child that is born to be king of the Jews; for we saw his star when it rose and we are come to do
3. him obeisance. But when king Herod heard

this he was disturbed and all Jerusalem with
2:4. him, and summoning together all the high priests and scribes of the people he enquired of them where the messiah should be born.
5. They told him, In Bethlehem of Judea, for thus it is written through the prophet:
6. And thou, Bethlehem (in the) land of (Mic. 5:2; Hebr.)
Judah,
Art far from least among the rulers of Judah,
For from thee shall come forth one to be a ruler
Who shall shepherd my people Israel.
7. So Herod called the astrologers secretly and ascertained from them the time when the
8. star appeared. Then he sent them to Bethlehem saying, Go and make careful enquiry concerning the child, and when you have found him report it to me, so that I too may
9. go and do him obeisance. And the astrologers hearkened to the king and went their way. And lo, the star which they had seen at its rising went in front of them till it came and stood over the place where the
10. child was. And when they saw the star
11. they rejoiced very greatly. And coming into the house they saw the child with his mother Mary, and prostrating themselves they did him obeisance. Then, opening their caskets, they offered him gifts of gold
12. and frankincense and myrrh. But after they had been divinely forewarned in a dream not to return to Herod they went back to their own country by a different route.

iv. Flight into Egypt.

13. And after they were gone lo, an angel of the Lord appeareth to Joseph in a dream, saying, Rise, take with thee the child and his mother and flee into Egypt, and stay there until I tell thee. For Herod is about
14. to seek for the child to kill him. So he arose and took with him the child and its mother by night and got away to Egypt, where he
15. stayed until the death of Herod. This was to fulfil the word spoken by the Lord through the prophet: Out of Egypt I called my son. (Hos. 11:1; Hebr.)

N

v. Herod Seeks the Child's Life.

2:16. Then Herod, when he saw that the astrologers had trifled with him, was greatly enraged and sent and slew all the male children in Bethlehem and its whole neighborhood from two years of age and under, according to the time which he had ascertained from the astrologers. Then was the saying fulfilled which had been uttered by the prophet Jeremiah: N

18. A cry was heard in Ramah, (Jer. 31:15, Hebr.)
weeping and great lamentation;
Rachel weeping for her children,
inconsolable because of their death.

vi. Settlement in Nazareth.

19. But when Herod died lo, an angel of the Lord appeareth in a dream to Joseph in Egypt, N
20. saying, Rise, take with thee the child and his mother and go into the land of Israel, (Ex. 4:19)
for those who sought the child's life are
21. dead. So he rose, took with him the child and its mother and came into the land of
22. Israel; but when he heard that Archelaus was king over Judea in succession to his father Herod he was afraid to go thither, and receiving divine warning in a dream
23. he withdrew to the regions of Galilee, and came and dwelt in a town called Nazareth, so that the saying of the prophets might be fulfilled: He shall be called a Nazarene. (Is. 11:1? Hebr.)

BOOK I

CONCERNING DISCIPLESHIP

" Be ye therefore imitators of God as beloved sons, and make love your rule of life."
Eph. 5:1

DIVISION A. INTRODUCTORY NARRATIVE. CHH. 3–4

i. John Baptizes the People.

3:1. And in those days cometh John the Baptist M [1]
on the scene preaching in the wilderness of Mk 1:3–6
2. Judea, ***saying, Repent; for the kingdom of***
3. ***heaven is at hand.*** For this was the man
spoken of by the prophet Isaiah:
A voice crying in the wilderness: (Is. 40:3)
Prepare a highway for the Lord,
Make straight the paths for him.
4. The aforesaid John had clothes woven of
camel's hair, and a leather girdle around
his loins, and his food was locusts and wild
5. honey. Then Jerusalem and all Judea
————and all the region of Jordan (Q, Lk 3:3)
————went forth unto him, and were
6. baptized by him in the river Jordan confes-
7. sing their sins.————But when he saw Q
many ***of the Pharisees and Sadducees*** com-
ing to his baptism he said to them, Ye Lk 3:7–9
brood of vipers, who told you there was
escape for you from the coming Wrath?
8. Produce, then, fruit answering to your re-
9. pentance, instead of presuming to say to
yourselves, We have Abraham as our
father. I tell you, God is able to raise up
children to Abraham out of these stones!
10 Already the axe is lying at the root of
the trees; every tree, therefore, that is not
producing good fruit will be cut down
11. and cast into the fire.————I baptize M(S)
you in water unto repentance, but he Mk 1:7 f.
that is coming after me is mightier, whose
very shoes I am not worthy to take off.
He will baptize you with ***the holy Spirit*** R(M)
12. ***and***————fire. His winnowing fan is Q
in his hand, and he will clean up his Lk 3:16b–17

p [1] M = Mk. No occasion appears for the symbol M = Proto-Mt (Streeter).

threshing floor; the wheat he will gather into his garner, but the chaff he will burn up with fire unquenchable.

ii. Jesus being Baptized is Called of God.

3:13. Then cometh Jesus on the scene unto John at the Jordan to be baptized by him.——— M Mk 1:9

14. ——But (John) sought to prevent him saying, I have need to be baptized by thee, (N?)

15. and dost thou come to me! But Jesus said to him in reply, So let it be for the present, for it is fitting to perform thus every act of righteousness. So he allowed him.——

16. ———And forthwith, after Jesus had been baptized and had come up out of the water, M(S) Mk 1:9–11 lo, the heavens were opened and he saw the Spirit of God coming down like a dove

17. to rest upon him. And lo, a voice from heaven saying:

This is my Son, the Beloved; my choice was fixed upon him. (Is. 42:1)

iii. He is put to the Test by Satan.

4:1. Then Jesus was led up into the wilderness by the Spirit to be tempted by the devil. Q Lk 4:1–13

2. And when he had fasted forty days and

3. forty nights he felt hungry thereafter. And the tempter came up and said to him, If thou art a Son of God tell these stones to

4. become loaves. But he answered, It is written:

Man shall not live on bread alone, but on everything that issues from the mouth of God. (Dt. 8:3, LXX. Sap. 16:25 f.)

5. Then the devil bringeth him into the holy city and set him on the pinnacle of the

6. temple and saith to him, If thou art a Son of God, cast thyself down; for it is written:

He will give his angels charge over thee, (Ps. 90:11 f., LXX)
They will bear thee up on their hands,
Lest thou strike thy foot against a stone.

7. Jesus said to him, It is written again, Thou shalt not put the Lord thy God to the test. (Dt. 6:16, LXX)

8. Again the devil bringeth him to an exceeding high mountain and showeth him all the kingdoms of the world and their splendor,

9. and said to him, I will give thee all these things if thou wilt prostrate thyself and

4:10. pay homage to me. Then Jesus saith to
him, Begone, Satan, for it is written, Thou (Dt. 6:13, LXX)
shalt do homage to the Lord thy God, and
11. him only shalt thou worship. Then the
devil leaveth him, and lo, angels came and
ministered to him.

iv. He Chooses the Darkest Region for his Work.

12. Now when (Jesus) heard that John had been M
delivered up he withdrew into Galilee;—— Mk 1:14
13. ———and leaving Nazareth he came and R(N)
settled at Capernaum, which is beside the
lake, in the borders of Zebulun and Naph-
14. tali, so that the word spoken by Isaiah the
prophet might be fulfilled, who said:
15. Land of Zebulun and land of Naphtali, (Is. 8:23–9:1,
Extending toward the sea, eastward of Hebr.)
Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles!
16. The people that sat in darkness saw a
great light,
Even to those that sat in the region
and shadow of death,
Upon them arose the dawn.
17. ————From that time on Jesus began M
to preach saying, Repent; for the kingdom Mk 1:15
of ***heaven*** is at hand.

v. He Calls four Disciples and Evangelizes Galilee.

18. And as he was walking beside the sea of M
Galilee he saw two brothers, Simon called Mk 1:16–20
Peter, and Andrew his brother, casting a
net in the sea—for they were fishermen;
19. so he saith to them, Come, follow me, and
20. I will make you fishers of men. And
straightway they left their nets and fol-
21. lowed him. And going on thence he saw
two other brothers, James son of Zebedee
and John his brother, mending their nets
in the boat with Zebedee their father. And
22. he called them, and straightway they left
the boat and their father and followed him.
23. So he went about through all Galilee, teach- M
ing in their synagogues, preaching the Mk 1:39
gospel of the kingdom, ***and healing every*** R (*Cf.* 9:35)
kind of malady and disease among the
24. ***people.*** ————And his fame spread M
throughout Syria, and men brought to Mk 3:7–12
him all their sick, afflicted with various

diseases and complaints, demoniacs, epileptics, and paralytics, and he healed them.
4:25. And great multitudes followed from Galilee and Decapolis and Jerusalem and Judea and Trans-Jordan.

DIVISION B. FIRST DISCOURSE. CHH. 5–7

i. The Exordium. Jesus Blesses and Charges his Followers.

5:1. When he saw the multitudes he went up to the table-land and sat down, and his disciples — R(MQ) Mk 3:13; Lk 6:20
2. came up to him and he opened his lips and began to teach them, saying:

3. Blessed are those that are *spiritually* poor, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. — Q(R) Lk 6:20 f.
4. Blessed are those that mourn, for the consolation is for them.
6. Blessed are those that hunger and thirst *for salvation,* for they shall be satisfied.

5.[2] *Blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the earth.* — R Pss. 37:11 and 24:3 f.
7. *Blessed are the merciful for they shall find mercy.*
8. *Blessed are the inwardly pure for admission to God's presence is for them.*
9. *Blessed are the peacemakers for the name "sons of God" belongs to them.*
10. *Blessed are they that are persecuted because of their righteousness; for the kingdom of heaven is theirs.*

11. Blessed are ye when men revile you and persecute you and say all manner of evil against you on my account *falsely.* — Q(R) Lk 6:22 f.
12. Rejoice and exult, for great is the reward stored up for you in heaven, for so did they persecute the prophets before you.

13. *Ye are the salt of the earth.* But if salt becomes insipid how can its taste be restored? It is — R(Q) Lk 14:34 f.

[2] The better Mss place verse 5 after verse 6.

no longer fit for anything but to be cast into the street and trodden down by men. (Mk 9:50)

5:14. ————*Ye are the light of the world.* R(O)
A city on top of a hill cannot be hid.——— (Ox. Log. VII)
15. ——Neither do men light a lamp and put Q
it under the peck-measure; they put it on Lk 11:33
the lamp-stand and it gives light to all that (Mk 4:21)
16. are in the house.————*Let your light so* R
shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in heaven.

ii. The New Torah.

17. *Do not imagine that I am come to destroy the* R
Law or the Prophets. I came not to destroy
18. *but to fulfil.*————For I give you my Q(R)
word, till heaven and earth pass away not Lk 16:17
an iota nor a comma shall pass *from the Law* until everything is made valid.———
19. ——Therefore everyone who declares even P
one of these least commands invalid, and (O?)
teaches men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven; but whoever obeys and teaches them, he shall be called great in the
20. kingdom of heaven. *For I tell you, unless* R
your righteousness exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees you shall never enter the kingdom of heaven.

(a) Inward Righteousness

1. *Murder*

21. You have heard how the men of old were com- P(S?)
manded: Thou shalt do no murder, who- (Dt. 5:18, LXX)
soever commits murder will be liable to
22. judgment. But I say to you, Whosoever is angry with his brother shall be liable to (divine) judgment. (And again), Whosoever shall say to his brother, "Scoundrel" shall be amenable to the Sanhedrin. (But I say), Whosoever shall call him "fool" will be amenable to the fire of Gehenna.
23. ————If, therefore, thou art offering P(O?)
thy gift before the altar, and there remem-
berest that thy brother hath a grievance (*Cf.* Sir. 28:2; 35:
24. against thee, leave thy gift lying there be- 1–3; and 6:14 f.;
fore the very altar; go first and be reconciled 18:21–35)
to thy brother, then come back and offer

5:25. thy gift.————Hasten to make terms Q
with thine opponent whilst thou are with Lk 12:57–59
him on the way to court, lest the opponent
hand thee over to the judge and the judge to
26. the sheriff and thou be thrown into jail. I
give thee my word, thou shalt get no release
thence till thou have paid the last farthing.

2. *Adultery*

27. You have heard that it was said, Thou shalt P(S?)
28. not commit adultery. But I tell you, Every (Dt. 5:17, LXX)
man that looks lustfully upon a woman has
committed adultery with her already in his
heart.
29. And if thy right eye cause thee to sin S
pluck it out and cast it away; 18:8 f. and Mk
Better for thee to lose one of thy members 9:43–47
than to have thy whole body flung into
Gehenna.
30. And if thy right hand cause thee to sin cut
it off and cast it away:
Better for thee to lose one of thy members
than to have thy whole body flung into
Gehenna.
31. It used to be said, Whoever divorces his wife R?S?
32. must give her a certificate. But I say unto (Dt. 24:1)
you, Any man that repudiates his wife ***except because of her unchastity*** makes her
an adulteress; and whosoever marries a divorced woman commits adultery.

3. *Perjury*

33. Again you have heard how the men of old were P(S?)
told, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but (Dt. 5:11; Ps.
34. shalt fulfil thy vows unto the Lord. But 50:14)
I say unto you: Utter no oath whatever; ***neither by heaven, for it is the throne of God;***
35. ***nor by earth, for it is His footstool; nor by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the Great***
36. ***King; neither swear by thy head, for thou canst not make one hair white or black.***
37. Let what you say be simply Yes or No.
Whatever goes beyond that springs from
evil.

4. *Retaliation*

38. You have heard the precept: An eye for an eye P(S?)
39. and a tooth for a tooth. But I bid you—— (Dt. 19:21)

———not to resist evil; and if any man smites thee on the right cheek, turn to him Q(S)
5:40. the other also, and if any man would sue Lk 6:29 f.
41. thee for thy tunic let him have thy cloak as well; and if any man would impress thee for
42. one mile, go with him two; give to him that asks of thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not away.

5. *Particularism*

43. You have heard the precept: Love thy neighbor, Q
44. and hate thine enemy. But I say to you, Lk 6:32–36
Love your enemies, and pray for those that (Lev. 19:18)
45. persecute you, that you may be sons of your Father in heaven; for He makes his sun to rise on the evil and the good and
46. sends rain on the just and the unjust. For if you love only those that love you, what is there in that to claim reward? Do not
47. the very tax-collectors the same? And if you greet your fellow-countrymen only, what is there exceptional in that? Do not
48. even the Gentiles the same? You, therefore, must show kindness without limit, as does your heavenly Father.

iii. Filial Worship.

6:1. ***Beware of practicing your acts of piety in the sight of men to gain their approbation; otherwise you can claim no reward from*** R
2. ***your Father in heaven.***————So when P
thou givest alms, sound not a trumpet be- (S?)
fore thee, as do the hypocrites in their synagogues and on the streets, to win praise from men. I give you my word, they have all
3. there is to their reward. But when thou art giving alms let not thy left hand know what
4. thy right hand is doing; that thine almsgiving may be in secret, and thy reward shall be from thy Father that seeth in secret.
5. Again when you pray, you shall not be like the hypocrites. For they love to stand and pray in the synagogues and on the street-corners, to be observed of men. I give you my word, they get all there is to their re-
6. ward. But when thou prayest enter thy private room and shut the door and pray to

thy Father that is in secret; and thy Father that seeth in secret shall reward thee.

6:7. *And when you pray let it not be by rote, like* R
the heathen, for they think they will be
8. *heard for their abundance of words. Be not*
like them, for your Father knoweth the
things whereof you have need before you
9. *ask Him. Pray ye, then, after this manner:*
Our Father *in heaven,* Thy name be sancti- Q
fied. Lk 11:2–4
10. Thy kingdom come, *Thy will be done on*
earth as in heaven.
11. Give us today our daily bread,
12. And forgive us our debts as we have for-
given our debtors,
13. And bring us not into trial, *but deliver*
us from evil.
14. *For if you forgive men their trespasses your* R
15. *heavenly Father will forgive you; but if you*
do not forgive men neither will your Father
forgive your trespasses.
16. And when you fast be not disfigured like the P
hypocrites; for they affect a look of dis- (S?)
tress to make a show of their fasting before
men. I give you my word they get all there
17. is to their reward. But when thou art fast-
18. ing, anoint thy head and bathe thy face, that
thou mayst not seem to men to be fasting,
but to thy Father who is in secret, and thy
Father who seeth in secret will repay thee.

iv. Treasure in Heaven.

19. Lay up for yourselves no treasures upon earth, Q
where moth and rust corrode, and where Lk 12:33 f.
20. thieves break in and steal; but lay up treas-
ures for yourselves in heaven, where neither
moth nor rust corrode, and where thieves
21. do not break in and steal. For where your
treasure is there will your heart be also.——
22. ———The lamp of the body is the eye: so Q
if thine eye be single (generous), thy whole Lk 11:34 f.
23. body will be illumined; but if thine eye be
evil thy whole body will be darkened. And
if the light itself in thee be dark how great is
24. the darkness!————No one can serve Q
two masters; for either he will hate one and Lk 16:13
love the other, or else he will stand by one
and despise the other. Ye cannot serve

6:25. God and Mammon.————Therefore I Q
bid you, Be not anxious for your living, Lk 12:22–31
what ye are to eat or drink, or for your
26. body as to what ye shall put on. Consider the *birds of the sky,* how they neither
sow nor reap and gather not into barns, and
your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are
27. you not of more value than they? And
which of you by being anxious can add one
28. span to his age (stature)? And why are ye
anxious about clothing? Consider the lilies
of the field, how they grow: they toil not,
29. nor do they spin. Yet I tell you that even
Solomon in all his splendor was not robed
30. like one of these. Now if God doth so clothe
the grass of the field, which blooms today
and tomorrow is flung into the oven, will He
not much more clothe you, ye half-believers!
31. Therefore be not anxious, crying, What shall
we have to eat? or, What shall we have to
32. drink? or How shall we get clothing? For
all these things the heathen seek after; for
your heavenly Father knoweth that you
33. need all these things. But seek ye first His
kingdom *and His approbation* and all these
things will be supplied to you over and
34. above.————***Therefore be not anxious for the morrow, for the morrow will provide its own anxiety.*** "The day's own R (O?)
trouble is enough for the day."

v. Self-judgment.

7:1. Judge not, that you may not be judged your- Q
2. selves; for the judgment you apply will Lk 6:37–42
be applied to you, and the standard you use
for measurement will be used in your own
3. case. Why note the splinter in thy brother's
eye and take no heed to the plank in thine
4. own eye? How canst thou say to thy
brother, Let me remove the splinter from
thine eye, and lo, there is a plank in thine
5. own. Thou hypocrite, remove first the plank
from thine own eye, and then thou wilt
have clear vision to remove the splinter from
6. thy brother's eye.————Give not holy
flesh to the dogs, lest they turn their fangs P
against you, and cast not your pearls before (O.)
swine, lest they trample them under foot.

vi. Answer to Prayer. Colophon.

7:7. Ask and ye shall receive, seek and ye shall find, Q
knock and the door will be opened to you. Lk 11:9–13
8. For everyone that asketh receiveth, and
he that seeketh findeth and to him that
9. knocketh the door is opened. Nay, what
man is there of you who when asked by his
10. son for a loaf will give him a stone? Or if he
11. ask for a fish will he give him a serpent? So,
then, if you, evil though you be, know how
to give good gifts to your children, how
much more will your Father in heaven give
good things to them that ask Him?———
12. ——All things therefore, whatsoever ye Q
would that men should do to you, do ye Lk 6:31
likewise to them; ***for that is the substance of Law and Prophets.*** (R)

vii. False and True Teaching.

13. Enter ye in through the narrow gate;———— Q Lk 13:23 f.
for wide and spacious is the way that lead- (R)
14. ***eth to destruction, and many are they that enter through it.*** For narrow and straitened
is the way that leadeth into life, and few are
they that find it.
15. ————***Beware of the false prophets. They*** R
come to you in the garb of sheep but (Acts 20:29 f.)
16. ***inwardly they are voracious wolves. But ye may know them by their fruits.*** Do men Q
17. gather grapes of thorns or figs from thistles? Lk 6:43 f.
So every tree that is good bears sound fruits,
18. but the rotten tree bears bad fruits. A good (Mt 12:33)
tree cannot bear bad fruits nor can a rotten
19. tree bear sound fruits.————Every
tree that does not produce good fruit is Q
cut down and cast into the fire.——— Mt 3:10=Lk 3:9
20. ——***So, then, you may know them by their***
21. ***fruits.————Not everyone that*** says to R(Q)
me, Lord, Lord! ***will have admission to the*** Lk 6:46–49
kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the
will ***of my Father in heaven.————***
22. Many will say ***to me*** in that Day: Lord, Q
Lord, did we not ***prophesy in thy name,*** did Lk 13:26 f.
we not ***exorcise in thy name, and in thy***
23. ***name do many miracles?*** Then will ***I*** de-
clare to them: I never knew you; begone (Ps. 6:8)
from my presence, ye workers of lawless-
ness.

7:24. ————Everyone, therefore, that hearkens Q
to these words of mine and acts upon Lk 6:47–49
them may be compared to a prudent
man who built his house upon the ledge.
25. And the rain came down and the floods
rose and the winds blew and beat upon
that house, and it fell not, for it was
26. founded upon rock. And everyone that
hearkens to these words of mine and does
not act upon them may be compared to a
foolish man that built his house upon the
27. sand. And the rain came down and the
floods rose and the winds blew and beat
upon that house, and it fell, and great was
the fall thereof.
28. AND IT CAME TO PASS WHEN JESUS HAD FINISHED R(M)
THESE SAYINGS————THE CROWDS WERE (Mk 1:22)
29. ASTONISHED AT HIS TEACHING; FOR HIS
TEACHING WAS AS OF ONE THAT HAS AU-
THORITY AND NOT LIKE THAT OF THEIR
SCRIBES.

BOOK II

CONCERNING APOSTLESHIP

Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among you. II Cor. 12:12.
Suffer hardship, do the work of an evangelist. II Tim. 4:5.

DIVISION A. INTRODUCTORY NARRATIVE. CHH. 8-9

i. Three Faith-healings.

8:1. ***Now when he had come down from the table-***
land great crowds followed him.————
2. And lo, a leper came and did him obeisance, M(S?)
saying, Sir, if thou only choose thou canst Mk 1:40–45
3. make me clean. And he stretched forth his
hand and touched him, saying, I will; be
thou cleansed. And immediately his leprosy
4. was cleansed. And Jesus saith to him, See
thou tell no man; but go, show thyself to
the priest and offer the gift that Moses com-
manded as evidence for them.
5. And when he had entered Capernaum a cen- Q
6. turion came up and entreated him, say- Lk 7:1–10
ing, My servant is lying at home paralyzed,
7. in terrible distress. He saith to him, I will
8. come and heal him. The centurion an-
swered, Sir, I am not worthy that thou
shouldst come under my roof; only say the
9. word, and my servant will be cured. For I
myself am a man under authority, and I
have soldiers under me. To one I say, Go,
and he goes, to another Come, and he
comes, and to my slave, Do this, and he does
10. it. And when Jesus heard that he marvelled,
and said to those that were following, I give
you my word, Nowhere in Israel have I
11. found such faith as this.————I tell Q
you many will come from east and west Lk 13:28–30
and sit down at the feast beside Abraham,
Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of ***heaven,***
while the sons of the kingdom are expelled
12. into the darkness outside. In that place
there will be wailing and gnashing of teeth.
13. ————***And Jesus said to the centurion,*** R
Go; be it unto thee according to thy faith.
And the servant was cured that very hour.

8:14. And when Jesus was come into Peter's house M
he saw his wife's mother lying ill with fever. Mk 1:29–34
15. And he took her by the hand and the fever
left her, so that she rose and ministered to
16. him. And when evening came they brought
him many demoniacs, and he cast out the
spirits with a word and healed all that were
17. sick————*that the word spoken by* R
the prophet Isaiah might be fulfilled: He N
took away our sicknesses and removed our (Is. 53:4, Hbr.)
diseases.

ii. Exorcisms and Mighty Works.

18. *And when Jesus saw great crowds around him* R
he gave orders to depart to the other side.
19. ————And a certain scribe came up Q
and said to him, Teacher, I will follow thee Lk 9:57–60
20. whithersoever thou goest. And Jesus saith
to him, The foxes have holes, and the birds
of the sky have nests, but the Son of Man
21. hath not a place to lay his head. Another,
one of the disciples, said to him, Sir let me
22. first go home and bury my father. But he
saith to him, Follow me, and leave the dead
to bury their own dead.
23. Then he embarked in the boat, and his dis- M
24. ciples followed him. And a great storm Mk 4:35–41
arose on the lake so that the boat was being
swamped by the waves; but he was sleeping.
25. And they came and awakened him, saying,
26. Help, Master, we are perishing! *And he*
saith to them, Why are ye frightened, ye
half-believers? Then he arose and rebuked
the wind and the sea, and a great calm en-
27. sued. But the men were astonished, saying,
What sort of man is this, that even the
winds and sea obey him?
28. And when he reached the other side, the dis- M
trict of the *Gadarenes, two* demoniacs Mk 5:1–20
met him, coming forth from the tombs; so
violent were they that no one could pass
29. that way. And lo, they cried out saying,
Thou Son of God, what business hast thou
with us? Art thou come hither before the
30. time to torment us? Now in the distance
31. there was a herd of many swine feeding. So
the demons entreated him, saying, If thou
intendest to drive us out send us into that

8:32. herd of swine. He answered, Go. So they
came out and entered into the swine, and lo,
the whole herd plunged down the declivity
33. into the sea and perished in the water. But
the herdsmen fled, and entering the city
they reported the whole affair and what had
34. happened to the demoniacs. And lo, the
whole city came out to meet Jesus; and
when they saw him they besought him to
leave their country.

9:1. So he embarked in the boat and crossing over M
2. came to his own city. And lo, they brought Mk 2:1–12
to him a paralytic lying on a pallet. And
when Jesus saw their faith he said to the
paralytic, Courage, my son, thy sins are
3. forgiven. And lo, some of the scribes said
to themselves, This man speaks blasphemy!
4. Jesus perceived what they were thinking
and said, Why do ye harbor evil thoughts in
5. your minds? Which is easier, to say, Thy
sins are forgiven; or to say, Rise and walk?
6. But in order that you may know that the
Son of Man has authority on earth to for-
give sins—he then said to the paralytic,
7. Rise, take up thy pallet and go home. And
8. he got up and went off home. And the
crowds that saw it were awestruck and gave
glory to God *for having given such author-
ity to men.*

iii. Vocations and Wonders.

9. And as Jesus passed on from thence he saw a M
man named *Matthew* sitting at the tax- Mk 2:13–17
office, and said to him, Follow me; and he
10. rose up and followed him. And as he was
seated at table in his house lo, many tax-
collectors and sinners took places along
11. with Jesus and his disciples. And when the
Pharisees saw this, they said to his disciples,
Why doth your teacher eat with the tax-
12. collectors and sinners? But when he heard
it he said, They that are well have no need
13. of a physician, but those who are sick.——
———*Go learn what the scripture means:* (R)
I desire mercy rather than sacrifice.——— (Hos. 6:6, LXX)
——For I did not come to invite just men
but sinners.
14. Then the disciples of John came up to him M

saying, Why do we and the Pharisees keep Mk 2:18–22
9:15. fasts, but thy disciples do not fast? And
Jesus said to them, Can guests at a wedding
mourn while the bridegroom is among them?
A time will come when the bridegroom will
be taken from them, and then they will fast.
16. No one sews a piece of unfulled cloth on an
old garment, for the patch tears away from
the garment and the rent becomes worse.
17. Neither do they put new wine into old
wine-skins, otherwise the wine-skins burst;
the wine is spilt and the wine-skins are
ruined. They put new wine into new wine-
skins and so both are kept safe.
18. As he was saying this to them lo, an official M
came in and did him obeisance, saying, My Mk 5:21–43
daughter has just died; but come and lay
thy hand upon her and she will come to life.
19. And Jesus rose up and followed him, to-
gether with his disciples.
20. And lo, a woman who had had a hemorrhage
for twelve years came up behind and
touched the tassel of his robe; for she said
21. to herself, If I only touch his robe I shall be
22. healed. But Jesus turned around, and when
he saw her he said, Courage, my daughter,
thy faith hath healed thee. And the woman
was cured from that hour.
23. Now when Jesus came to the official's house
and saw the flute-players and the crowd
24. making a din, he said, Give place, the little
girl is not dead but asleep. And they
25. laughed at him. But when the crowd had
been put forth he went in and took her by
the hand, and the little girl rose up.———
26. ——*And the fame of this spread all over
that land.*
27. And as Jesus was passing along from thence R(M)
two blind men followed him, *crying out:* Mk 8:22–26; 10:
28. *Have pity on us, thou Son of David.* And 47; Mt 12:22–24
when he had come into the house the blind (S?)
men came up to him; and Jesus saith unto
them, Believe ye that I am able to do this?
29. *They say to him, Yes, sir.* Then he touched
their eyes, saying, *According to your faith* (8:13)
30. *be it unto you.* And *their* eyes were opened.
And Jesus charged them sternly, saying, (Mk 1:43–45)
31. *See that no one knows of this. But they*

went out and spread his fame all over that country.

9:32. And as they went out, lo, there was brought R(M)
to him a deaf-mute possessed by a demon. Mk 7:31–37; Mt
33. And when the demon had been cast out the 12:22–24
deaf-mute began to speak. And the crowds (S?)
were amazed, saying, Such a thing was
never seen in Israel! [34]
35. And Jesus made a circuit of all the cities and M
villages, teaching ***in their synagogues,*** Mk 6:6 f.
preaching the gospel of the kingdom and (R Mt 4:23)
healing every disease and every sickness.

DIVISION B. THE DISCOURSE, 9:36–10:42

i. Appointment and Instructions of the Twelve.

9:36. Now when (Jesus) saw the crowds he was moved M
with pity for them, for they were harassed Mk 6:34
and forlorn, like sheep that have no shep-
37. herd.————Then said he to his dis- Q, Lk 10:2
ciples, The harvest is plentiful but the
38. laborers are few; entreat, therefore, the
Lord of the harvest to send forth laborers
10:1. into His harvest-field.————And sum- (Mk 6:7)
moning his twelve disciples he gave them
authority over unclean spirits to cast them
out, ***and to heal every disease and every*** (4:23:9:35)
sickness.
2. These are the names of the twelve apostles: Mk 3:14–19
Simon called Peter and Andrew his brother,
And James son of Zebedee and John his
brother,
3. Philip and Bartholomew,
Thomas and Matthew ***the tax-collector*** (N?)
James son of Alphaeus and Lebbaeus,
4. Simon the Zealot and Judas Iscariot, who
betrayed him.
5. ***These twelve Jesus sent forth, giving them the*** R
following instructions:————Go not
among the Gentiles, and enter no city of (N?)
6. the Samaritans, ***but go rather to the lost*** (15:24)
sheep of the house of Israel.————
7. And as you go, preach, saying, The king- (Q)
8. dom of ***heaven*** is at hand. Heal the sick, Lk 10:9
raise the dead, cleanse lepers, cast out
demons. Freely ye received, freely give.
9. ————Get you neither gold nor silver M(S)
10. nor copper in your girdles, nor a wallet for Mk 6:8–11

the road, nor an extra garment, nor sandals, nor a staff. ***For "the workman de-*** (R)
10:11. ***serves his food."***————Whatever city I Tim. 5:18
or village ye enter, find out who in it is Q
worthy, and stay with him till you leave Lk 10:5–12
12. the place. When you enter the house utter
a blessing on it, and if the household be
13. worthy let the peace you invoke come upon
it, but if it be not worthy let your peace
14. return upon yourselves. Whoever will not
receive you nor listen to your message, as
you leave that house ***or city*** shake off the
15. very dust from your feet.————***I give*** R
you my word, in the day of judgment it (11:24MLk 10:
will be more bearable for Sodom and Go- 12)
morrha than for that city.

ii. Encouragement to Meet Persecutions.

16. Lo, I send you forth as sheep among wolves, Q
————***therefore be wise as serpents*** Lk 10:3 P(O?)
17. ***and guileless as doves.***————Beware M
of men, for they will hand you over to san- Mk 13:9–13
18. hedrins and scourge you in their synagogues,
and you will be haled before governors and
kings for my sake, that the witness may be
borne to them and to the Gentiles.———
19. ——And when they bring you up for trial (Q)
be not anxious as to what or how you shall Lk 12:11 f.
speak, for what you are to say will be given
20. you at the time. For it is not you that are
the speakers, the Spirit of your Father
will be speaking through you.————
21. Brother will betray brother to death and M
fathers their children, children will rise up (Mic. 7:6)
against parents and will put them to death,
22. and ye will be hated by all men on account
of my name. But he will be saved who
23. holds out to the end.————And when P
they persecute you in one city, flee to the (N?O?)
next; for I give you my word, you will not
have gone the rounds of the cities of Israel
before the Son of Man will have come.
24. A disciple is not above his teacher, nor a slave Q
25. above his master; enough for the disciple (Lk 6:40)
to fare like his teacher and the slave like
his master.————***If they have called*** R
the Master of the House Beelzebul [*i.e.* (12:24)
Master of the (heavenly) house] ***how much***

more will they miscall those of his household.

10:26. Therefore have no fear of them. For there is nothing covered up but shall be disclosed, — Q Lk 12:2–9
27. or hid that shall not be known. What I tell you in the darkness utter ye in the light, and what is whispered in your ear proclaim
28. from the housetop. And fear not those that kill the body but cannot kill the soul, but rather fear Him who can destroy both
29. soul and body in Gehenna. Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? Yet not one of them will fall to the ground without
30. leave from your Father; and as for you the very hairs of your head are all numbered. — (L, Lk 21:18)
31. Therefore fear not, ye are of more value
32. than many sparrows. Whosoever, then, acknowledges me before men, him will I acknowledge before my Father in heaven; — (S, Mk 8:38)
33. and whoso disowns me before men, him will I disown before my Father in heaven.
34. ————Do not imagine that I came to bring peace on earth; I came not to bring peace, — Q Lk 12:51–53
35. but a sword; for I came to set a man against his father, a daughter against her mother and a daughter-in-law against her — (S, Mk 13:12; Mic. 7:6)
36. mother-in-law, yea, a man's enemies will be the members of his own household.——— — Q(L?)
37. ——He that loves father or mother more than me is not worthy of me, and he that loves son or daughter more than me is not — Lk 14:26 f.
38. worthy of me. And he that will not take up his own cross and follow after me is not
39. worthy of me.————He that saves his life will lose it, and he that loses his life for my sake will find it. — Q Lk 17:33 (S, Mt 16:25=Mk 8:35=Lk 9:24)

iii. The Reward for Kindly Reception.

40. He that receives you receives me, and he that receives me receives Him that sent me—— — M(S) Mk 9:37, 41; Lk 10:16
41. ———"He that receives a prophet because he is a prophet will receive a prophet's reward, and he that receives a righteous man because he is a righteous man will receive a righteous man's reward."———— — P(O?)
42. And whoever gives one of these little ones even a cup of cold water to drink because — M

he is a disciple, I give you my word he shall not lose his reward.

11:1. AND IT CAME TO PASS WHEN JESUS HAD FINISHED GIVING DIRECTION TO HIS TWELVE DISCIPLES HE DEPARTED THENCE TO TEACH AND TO PREACH IN THEIR CITIES. R

BOOK III

CONCERNING THE HIDING OF THE REVELATION

"To Israel He saith 'All the day long did I spread out my hands to a disobedient and gainsaying people.'" "The hidden mystery is now manifested." Rom. 10:21; 16:25.

DIVISION A. ISRAEL IS STUMBLED. CHH. 11–12

i. Jesus and John.

11:2. Now when John heard in prison about the doings of the Christ, he sent by his disciples
3. to ask him, Art thou the Coming One, or
4. are we to look for another? And Jesus gave them answer, Go, report to John what ye
5. hear and see. The blind see, the lame walk, lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised to life, and the poor have glad
6. tidings proclaimed to them. Also, Blessed is he who is not repelled by anything in me.
7. When the messengers had taken their leave Jesus proceeded to address the crowds concerning John: What went ye out into the wilderness to gaze at? A reed swayed by
8. the wind? But why did you go forth? To see a man wearing luxurious clothes? Lo, the wearers of luxurious clothes are in royal
9. palaces. But why did you go forth? To see a prophet? Yea, I tell you, and far more
10. than a prophet. This is he of whom it stands written: Lo, I send my messenger before thy face, who shall prepare thy way before
11. thee. I give you my word, no greater man has arisen among the sons of women than John the Baptist, yet he that is but little in the kingdom of ***heaven*** is greater than he.
12. ————But from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of ***heaven***
13. suffers violence and violent men make booty of it. For all the prophets and the Law
14. prophesied until John, ***and if ye are willing to accept it he is the Elijah that was to come.***————He that hath ears, let him hearken.

Q Lk 7:18–35

(Is. 29:18 f.; 35: 5 f.; 61:1)

(Mal. 3:1 and Ex. 23:20 Hebr.)

Q Lk 16:16

R (Mk 9:13) M(S) Mk 4:9, 23

11:16. But to what shall I compare this generation? Q
They are like children sitting in the market Lk 7:31–35
17. place, who call out to their playmates, We
played the pipes to you and you would not
dance, we sang dirges and you would not
18. beat your breasts. For John came neither
eating nor drinking, and men say, He has a
19. demon. The Son of Man came eating and
drinking, and they say, Lo, a glutton and a
hard-drinker, a friend of tax-collectors and
sinners. Nevertheless wisdom is justified by
her *works*.

ii. Judgment on the Unrepentant.

20. *Then he proceeded to upbraid the cities in* R
which most of his miracles had been done,
21. *because they had not repented:* Woe to thee Q
Chorazin, woe to thee Bethsaida; for if the Lk 10:13–15
miracles had been done in Tyre and Sidon
that were wrought among you, they would
have repented long ago in sackcloth and
22. ashes. But I give you my word, it will be
more bearable for Tyre and Sidon in the day
23. of judgment than for you. And thou, Caper- (Is. 14:13–15)
naum, shalt thou be "exalted to heaven?
Thou shalt be thrust down to Hades!"
————*For if the miracles had been* R
done in Sodom which were wrought in (10:15)
24. *thee it would have stood to this day. But*
I tell you it will be more bearable in the
day of judgment for the land of Sodom
than for thee.
25. *On that occasion Jesus made this utterance:* Q
I praise thee, Father, Lord of heaven and Lk 10:21 f.
earth,
That thou didst hide these things from
the wise and understanding,
And didst reveal them to the simple-
minded.
26. Yea, Father, for such was thy divine
decree.

27. All truth has been revealed to me by my
Father;
And no one knows the Son except the
Father,
Nor does any know the Father except
the Son,

And he to whom the Son chooses to reveal Him.

11:28. *Come to me, all ye that toil and are burdened,* R
And I will give you rest. (Ecclus. 51:23–27)
29. *Take my yoke upon you and learn from me,*
For I am humble and gentle of spirit,
And ye will find rest for your souls;
30. *For my yoke is kindly and my burden light.*

iii. Pharisaic Opposition.

12:1. At that time Jesus walked one sabbath day M
through the wheatfields, and his disciples, Mk 2:23–28
being hungry, began to pluck the heads of
2. wheat and to eat. And when the Pharisees
saw it they said to him, Lo, thy disciples
are doing what is unlawful to be done on
3. the sabbath. But he said to them, Have ye (I Sam. 21:2–6)
not read what David did when he and his
4. men were hungry, how he went into the
house of God, and they ate the sacrificial
loaves, which it was unlawful for him or his
men or any except the priests alone to
5. eat?————*Or have ye not read in the* R
Law how the priests in the temple profane
6. *the sabbath and incur no guilt? I tell you* (Lk 11:31 f., Q)
a greater matter than the temple is here
7. *at issue. And if you had known what this*
scripture means, I care more for mercy (Hos. 6:6)
than for sacrifice, you would not have
8. *condemned the innocent.*————For the M
Son of Man is Lord of the sabbath.
9. And passing on thence he came into *their* syna- M
10. gogue. And lo, there was a man there with Mk 3:1–6
a withered hand, so in order to get a charge
against him they put to him the question,
Is it lawful to heal on the sabbath?———
11. ——And he said to them, What man is Q
there among you who, if he have *a single* (Lk 14:3, 5)
sheep and it fall into a pit on the sabbath,
12. will not lay hold of it and lift it out? *Well,*
then, of how much more value is a man
than a sheep? So that it is lawful to do good
13. *on the sabbath.*————Then he saith M
to the man, Stretch forth thy hand. And
he stretched it forth and it was restored

12:14. sound like the other. But the Pharisees
went out and conspired against him to
destroy him.
15. And when Jesus knew of it he ***withdrew*** from M
thence; and many followed him. And he Mk 3:7–12; *cf.*
healed them all, and charged them not Mt 4:24 f.
17. to make him known————***that the***
word spoken by Isaiah the prophet might
be fulfilled:
18. Behold my servant whom I chose, N
My beloved, on whom my soul fixed her (Is. 42:1–3, Hebr.)
choice.
I will put my Spirit upon him,
And he will proclaim religion to the Gen-
tiles.
19. He will not wrangle nor cry out,
Nor will any hear his voice in the streets.
20. The bruised reed he will not break,
Nor quench the smouldering lampwick,
Till he carries religion to victory.
21. ***And the Gentiles will hope in his name.*** (Is. 42:4b LXX)

iv. Blasphemy of the Scribes.

22. Then there was brought to him a demoniac, Q
blind and deaf-mute, and he healed him, so Lk 11:14–16; *cf.*
23. that the deaf-mute spoke ***and saw.*** And the Mt 9:32 f.
crowds were amazed ***and said, Can this be***
24. ***the Son of David?*** But when the Pharisees
heard of it they said, This fellow only casts
out demons by Beelzebul the prince of
25. the demons.————And knowing their Q
thoughts he said to them: Any kingdom Lk 11:17–23
divided against itself meets destruction,
and any city or household divided against
26. itself cannot stand. And if Satan be cast-
ing out Satan he is divided against him-
self; how, then, can his kingdom stand?
27. Besides, if I exorcise by Beelzebul, by whom
do your sons exorcise? Therefore they will
28. be your judges. But if my casting out of
demons is by the Spirit of God, then the
dominion of God has overtaken you un-
29. awares. Why, how can anyone enter the (Is. 49:24–26)
house of the Mighty and seize his belongings
unless he have first bound the Mighty one?
30. Then he will plunder his house. Whoever is
not with me is against me, and he who does
31. not gather with me scatters.————For M(S)

this reason I tell you, any sin or blasphemy will be forgiven men, but blasphemy against Mk 3:28
the Spirit will not be forgiven.————

12:32. And whosoever speaks a word against the Q
Son of Man it will be forgiven him, but Lk 12:10
whosoever speaks against the Holy Spirit, (Mk 3:29)
it will not be forgiven him, *whether in this world or the world to come.*————

33. *Either make the tree sound and its fruit* R(Q)
sound, or make the tree rotten and its fruit (Lk 6:43–45M
rotten; for the tree is known by its fruit. Mt 7:16–20)

34. ————*Ye brood of vipers, how can ye* (3:7; 23:33)
speak good, evil as ye are; for " the mouth (O?)
utters what the heart is full of."————

35. *The good man out of his good store brings*
out good, and the evil man out of his evil

36. *store brings out evil.————I give you* R
my word, men shall give account in the
day of judgment for every idle word that

37. *they speak, for " by thy words shalt thou* (O?)
be justified, and by thy words shalt thou
be condemned."

v. The Demand for a Sign.

38. ————Then some *of the scribes and Phari-* Q
sees made answer to him, Teacher, we Lk 11:16, 29–32
desire to see a sign from thee. But he

39. answered them: It is an evil and disloyal
generation that craves a sign, but no
sign will be given it but the sign of the

40. prophet Jonah; *for just as Jonah was three* R
days and three nights in the whale's belly, (*Cf.* Mk 8:20; Lk
so will the Son of Man be three days and 11:29; Mt 16:4)

41. *three nights in the heart of the earth.* At
the day of judgment the men of Nineveh will
rise up together with this generation and
show its condemnation. For they repented
at the preaching of Jonah, and lo, a greater
matter than (the preaching of) Jonah is

42. here at issue. The queen of the South will
rise up at the judgment together with this
generation and show its condemnation; for
she came from the ends of the earth to hear
the wisdom of Solomon, and lo, a greater
matter than (the wisdom of) Solomon is
here concerned.

43. Whenever the unclean spirit is cast out of a Q
man it wanders through desert places seek- Lk 11:24–26

12:44. ing a resting-place and finds none. Then it
says, I will return to my abode whence I
came forth. And when it comes it finds the
45. house vacant, swept, and set in order. Then
it goes and fetches seven other spirits worse
than itself; and they go in and dwell there.
So the last state of that man becomes worse
than the first. ***So will it be with this evil generation.***

46. While he was still addressing the crowds lo, M(S)
his mother and his brethren were stand- Mk 3:31–35
ing outside, seeking opportunity to speak (S, Lk 11:27 f.)
48. with him. [47] But he replied to the man
who told him this, Who is my mother? and
49. who are my brethren? And he stretched
forth his hand toward his disciples and said,
50. Behold my mother and my brethren! Who-
ever does the will of my Father in heaven,
he is my brother and sister and mother.

DIVISION B. TEACHING IN PARABLES, 13:1–53

i. Parables of the Kingdom.

13:1. That same day Jesus left the house and seated M
2. himself by the seaside; and as great crowds Mk 4:1–9
gathered to him he entered a boat and sat
down while all the crowd stood on the
3. beach. And he made to them a discourse
at length in parables saying,

4. Lo, the sower went forth to sow, and as he M
sowed some seed fell on the roadside and
5. the birds came and devoured it. Other seeds
fell on stony soil, where they had not much
earth, and sprouted at once because they
6. had no depth of soil; but when the sun rose
high they were scorched and withered away
7. for lack of root. Others fell among thorns,
and the thorns sprang up and choked them.
8. Others fell on good soil and produced a
crop, some bearing a hundredfold, some
9. sixty, some thirtyfold. He that has ears let
him hearken.

10. Then the disciples came up and said to him, M
Why dost thou speak to them in parables?
11. But he replied, Because it is to you that it
is granted to know the revelation of the
kingdom of ***heaven***, but to them it is not
12. granted.————For whosoever hath, (S?)

to him shall be given in superabundance, but from him that hath not even that which he hath shall be taken away.———— (Mk 4:25; Mt 25:29)

13:13. For this reason I speak to them in parables, because while looking they see not, and while hearing they hear not nor under-
14. stand.————*In their case the prophecy of Isaiah is being fulfilled:* R(M) (Is. 6:9 f., LXX)

15. You will hear and hear but never understand,
You will gaze and gaze but never perceive.
16. For the heart of this people is dense.
Their hearing has become dull,
And their eyes they have closed;
That they may not see with their eyes
Or hear with their ears,
Or understand with their minds,
And turn back, that I might heal them.

17. ————*But as for you,* Blessed are your eyes, *for they see, and your ears for they hear.* I give you my word, Many prophets and just men have longed to see the sights that you see, but saw them not, and to hear the words that you hear, but heard them not. Q Lk 10:23 f.

18. *Hearken ye, then, to the parable of the* M
19. *Sower.* When anyone hears the word of the Mk 4:13–20 kingdom and fails to understand it, the Evil one comes and snatches away what has been sown in his heart. Such is the man
20. who is sown by the roadside. As for him that is sown on stony ground, that is the man who hears the word and receives it at once
21. with joy, but having no root in himself he does not hold out. When tribulation comes or persecution on account of the word at
22. once he falls away. As for him who is sown among thorns, that is the man who hearkens to the word, but the cares of the world and the delusion of riches stifle the word and it
23. becomes unfruitful. As for him who is sown on good soil, that is the man who hears the word and understands it. This man brings forth fruit, now a hundred, now sixty, now thirtyfold.

24. *He set before them another parable,* saying: M(R)
The kingdom of *heaven* may be compared to Mk 4:26–29

13:25. a man who sowed *good* seed in his field, but
while *men* slept *his enemy came and made*
a new sowing of weeds among the wheat
26. *and departed.* When the blade sprouted
and bore fruit *then appeared the weeds also.*
27. *So the servants of the owner came and*
asked him, Sir, didst thou not sow good
seed in thy field? Whence, then, does it
28. *contain weeds? But he said to them, An*
enemy has done this. And the servants say
to him, Dost thou wish us, then, to go and
29. *weed them out? No, said he, lest in gather-*
ing out the weeds you root up the wheat
30. *together with them. Let both grow to-*
gether until harvest and at harvest time *I*
will tell the reapers, *Gather out first the*
weeds and tie them in bundles to be burnt, (3:12)
but gather the wheat into my granary.
31. *He set before them another parable,* saying: M
The kingdom of *heaven* may be compared
to a grain of mustard-seed which a man
32. took and sowed in his field. It is smaller
than any other seed, but when it gets its
growth it is larger than the plants and be-
comes a tree, so that the birds of the sky
come and nest in its branches.
33. ————He told them another parable: The Q
kingdom of *heaven* is like leaven which a Lk 13:20 f.
woman took and buried in three measures
of flour, till all of it was leavened.
34. Jesus said all this to the crowds in parables, M
and told them nothing without a parable, Mk 4:33 f.
35. *that the word spoken by Isaiah the prophet* R(N)
might be fulfilled,
I will open my mouth in parables, (Ps. 78:2, Hebr.)
I will utter things hid since the founda-
tion of the world.

ii. Private Exposition.

36. *Then he left the crowds and came indoors.* R
And his disciples came up to him saying,
Explain to us the parable of the weeds in
37. *the field. He answered, The sower of the*
38. *good seed is the Son of Man; the field is*
the world; the good seed—these are the sons
of the kingdom, and the weeds are the sons
39. *of the Evil one; the enemy who sowed them*
is the devil; the harvest is the consumma-

tion of the world and the reapers are the
13:40. *angels. So, then, just as the weeds are*
gathered out and burnt in the fire, so will it
41. *be at the consummation of the world. The*
Son of Man will send forth his angels, and
they will gather out from his kingdom all
things that cause falling away and those
42. *that work lawlessness and cast them into*
the furnace of fire; there will be the wailing (Lk 13:28)
43. *and gnashing of teeth. Then the just will*
shine like the sun in the kingdom of their
Father. He that has ears let him hearken. (Mk 4:9)
44. ————The kingdom of ***heaven*** is like treas- P(O?)
ure hid in a field, which a man found and
hid, and in his delight he goes and sells all
that he owns and buys that field.
45. Again the kingdom of ***heaven*** is like a trader in P(O?)
46. search of fine pearls. When he has found a
single costly pearl he goes and sells all he
owns and buys it.
47. *Again the kingdom of heaven is like a drag-* R
net cast into the sea, which collects fish of (Mk 1:17)
48. *every sort. When it was full they dragged it*
up to the beach and sitting down gathered
the good fish into vessels but threw away
49. *the bad. So will it be at the consummation*
of the world. The angels will go forth and
50. *separate the evil from the just, and cast*
them into the furnace of fire; there will be (Lk 13:28)
the wailing and the gnashing of teeth.
51. *Have you understood all this? They answered,*
Yes. And he said to them, For this reason R(O?)
52. *every scribe converted to the kingdom of*
heaven is like a householder who produces
out of his store things both new and old.
53. AND IT CAME TO PASS WHEN JESUS HAD FIN- R
ISHED THESE PARABLES HE DEPARTED
THENCE.

BOOK IV

CONCERNING CHURCH ADMINISTRATION

" Keep the unity of the Spirit." Eph. 4:3.
" All things indeed are clean; but it is good not to eat flesh nor drink wine, nor do anything whereby thy brother stumbleth." Rom. 14:20f.

DIVISION A. JESUS AND THE BROTHERHOOD. CHH. 14–17

i. The Agapé in Galilee.

13:54. And he came to his native place and pro- M
ceeded to teach the people in their syna- Mk 6:1–6
gogue, so that they were astonished and
said, Where did the man get this wisdom
55. and these miraculous powers? Is not this
the ***son of the*** carpenter? Is not his mother
called Mary, and his brethren James and
56. Joseph and Simon and Judas? And his
sisters, are they not all dwelling here among
57. us? Where, then, did he get all this? So
they were stumbled at him. But Jesus said
to them, A prophet is not without honor
save in his native place and his own house-
58. hold. And he ***performed but few*** miracles
there because of their want of faith.

14:1. At that time Herod the ***tetrarch*** heard the fame M
2. of Jesus and said to his servants, This is Mk 6:14–16
John the Baptist; he is risen from the
dead, and for this reason miracles are per-
formed through him.

3. For Herod had arrested John and bound and M
put him in prison on account of Hero- Mk 6:17–29
4. dias his brother Philip's wife; for John had
said to him, It is not lawful for thee to have
5. her. ***And though (Herod) desired to put (John) to death he was afraid of the people, for they considered John to be a prophet.***
6. But when Herod's birthday came the
daughter of Herodias danced before the
7. company and so pleased Herod that he
promised with an oath to give her whatever
8. she asked. So she, instigated by her mother,
said, Give me here on a platter the head of
9. John the Baptist. And the king, though he
was distressed, yet because of his oaths and

the guests present ordered it to be given her.
14:10. He sent and beheaded John in the prison,
11. and the head was brought on a platter and given to the girl and she carried it to her
12. mother. And his disciples came and took up the corpse and buried it;————*then* M
they went and reported the matter to Jesus. Mk 6:30–44
13. Now when Jesus heard it, he withdrew by boat M
to a desert place in private. And when the crowds heard of it they followed him on
14. foot out of the cities. So when he disembarked he saw a great multitude; and he had compassion on them and ***healed their sick.***
15. And when evening came the disciples approached him saying, It is a desert place and the hour is now late; send away the crowds that they may go into the villages
16. and buy themselves food. But he said to them, They have no need to go away; do ye
17. yourselves give them food. And they say to him, All we have here is five loaves and
18. two fishes. And he said, Bring them here
19. to me. Then he bade the crowds to sit down on the grass, and taking the five loaves and the two fishes he looked up to heaven and blessed and broke the loaves and gave to the disciples, and the disciples to the crowds.
20. And all ate and were satisfied, and of the broken pieces that remained over they
21. gathered up twelve baskets full. Now the men who ate numbered about five thousand, ***besides women and children.***
22. Then he compelled the disciples to embark in M
the boat and cross over before him to the Mk 6:45–52
other side, while he dismissed the crowds.
23. When he had dismissed the crowds he went up onto the plateau by himself to pray, and when evening came he was there alone.
24. But the boat was now midway across the sea, buffeted by the waves, for the wind
25. was against them. And in the fourth watch of the night he came to them, walking on
26. the sea. But when the disciples saw him walking on the sea they were terrified saying, It is an apparition; and they cried out
27. from fear. And forthwith he spoke to them saying, Courage, it is I, have no fear.——
28. ———And Peter answered him saying, P(N)

Lord, if it be thou, bid me come to thee
14:29. on the water. He said, Come. And Peter
got down from the boat and walked on
30. the water and came toward Jesus. But
facing the storm he was afraid and begin-
ning to sink he cried out, Lord, save me!
31. And forthwith Jesus stretched out his hand
and caught him saying, ***Thou half-believer,***
32. why didst thou doubt? And when they
had come up into the boat the wind dropped.
33. And they that were in the boat did him
obeisance saying, Truly thou art the Son of
God.
34. When they had crossed over they came to land — M
35. at Gennesaret. And the men of that region — Mk 6:53–56
recognized him and sent all over the sur- — (*Cf.* Mt 4:24 = Mk 3:10)
rounding country and brought to him all
that were sick and besought him to let them
only touch the tassel of his robe, and all
who touched it recovered.

ii. The Law of "Clean" and "Unclean."

15:1. Then Pharisees and scribes from Jerusalem
2. approached Jesus saying, Why do thy dis-
ciples transgress the tradition of the elders?
They do not wash their hands when they
3. take their food. But he replied, And why
do you transgress the command of God
4. with your traditions? God commanded say- — (Ex. 20:12)
ing Honor thy father and thy mother; and — (Ex. 21:17)
again, He that curses father or mother must
5. suffer death. But you say, Whoever says
to his father or mother, This money which
6. might go to you is dedicated to God, need
not honor his father or mother. So you ab-
rogate the law of God for the sake of your
7. own tradition. You hypocrites, well did
Isaiah prophesy concerning you when he said,
8. This people honor me with their lips — (Is. 29:13)
But their heart is far from me.
9. Vain is their worship of me,
For the doctrines they teach are mere
precepts of men.
10. Then he called up the crowd and said to them, — M(S)
11. Listen, and understand: Not what enters — Mk 7:14 f.
a man's mouth defiles him, what defiles — (Lk 11:39–41 = Mt 23:25 f.)
a man is what comes out of his mouth.
12. ***Then the disciples came up and said to him,*** — R(N?O?)

Knowest thou that the Pharisees took of-
15:13. *fence at what they heard thee say? But he replied saying,* Every plant which my O?
heavenly Father did not plant shall be
14. rooted up.————*Let them alone, they* Q
are blind leaders of the blind; and if the (Lk 6:39)
blind serve as guide to the blind both will
fall into the ditch.
15. And *Peter* spoke up saying, Explain the par- M
16. able to us. And he said, Can it be that Mk 7:17–23
17. you too are without understanding? Do
you not see that whatever goes into the
mouth passes into the belly and is voided
18. into the drain, while what comes out from
the mouth issues from the heart, and that
19. is what defiles the man? For from the heart
come forth evil designs, murders, adulteries,
fornications, thefts, false witness, slanders.
20. That is what defiles the man, *but eating*
without the ablutions does not defile.
21. Departing thence Jesus withdrew into the re- M(S?)
22. gions of Tyre *and Sidon.* And lo, a *Ca-* Mk 7:24–30
naanite woman *came forth from those bor-*
ders and cried out saying, Have pity on me,
Lord, *thou Son of David;* my daughter is (Mk 10:47 f.)
23. cruelly obsessed by a demon. *But he an-*
swered her not a word. Then his disciples
came up and begged him saying, Send her
away, for she keeps crying out after us.
24. *But he answered, I was not sent to any but* (10:6)
25. *the lost sheep of the house of Israel. Then*
the woman came and knelt before him say-
26. *ing, Lord, help me!* He answered, It is not
right to take the children's bread and throw
27. it to the dogs. No, sir, said she; but even
the dogs eat the crumbs that fall from their
28. masters' table. Then Jesus gave her answer:
O woman, *great is thy faith; be it unto thee*
as thou dost desire. And from that hour
her daughter was healed.

iii. The Agapé in Perea.

29. Leaving that country Jesus proceeded along M
the sea of Galilee and mounted to the Mk 7:31–37
30. plateau and established himself there. And
great crowds came to him bringing the
lame, blind, deaf-mute, maimed, and many
others. And they laid them at his feet, *and*

15:31. ***he healed them,*** so that the crowd marvelled when they saw the deaf-mutes speaking, the maimed restored, the lame walking, and the blind seeing; ***and they glorified the God of Israel.*** (9:32 f.; 12:22 f.) (Is. 29:23)

32. And Jesus called up his disciples and said, I have compassion on the crowd, for they have spent three days with me now, and they have nothing to eat. I am unwilling to dismiss them starving lest they faint on
33. the road. The disciples say to him, Whence should we get loaves enough in the wilder-
34. ness to satisfy so great a multitude? Jesus saith to them How many loaves have you? They answered, Seven, and a few little fish.
35. Then he directed the crowd to take seats
36. on the ground and took the seven loaves and the fishes and after giving thanks broke them and gave them to the disciples, and
37. the disciples to the crowds. And all ate and were satisfied, and of the fragments that remained over they collected seven ham-
38. pers full. The men who ate numbered four thousand ***besides the children and women.***
39. Then he dismissed the crowd, got into the boat and came into the district of ***Magadan.*** M Mk 8:1–10

16:1. And the Pharisees ***and Sadducees*** came up, and, in order to tempt him, asked him to show them a sign from heaven. But he an-
4. swered them, [2b–3] It is an evil and disloyal generation that calls for a sign, and no sign shall be given it except the sign of Jonah. Then he left them and went away. M(S) Mk 8:11–13 (12:38 f. = Lk 11: 16, 29)

5. When the disciples had reached the opposite shore they found they had forgotten to
6. bring any bread. And Jesus said to them, Take heed, beware of the leaven of the
7. Pharisees ***and Sadducees.*** They argued with one another saying, We did not bring
8. any bread. And Jesus, perceiving it, said, ***You half-believers!*** Why are you arguing with one another at having brought no
9. bread? Do you not yet understand? Do you not remember the five loaves of the five thousand and how many baskets full you
10. collected? And the seven loaves of the four thousand and how many hampers you col-
11. lected? Why do you not see ***that I was not*** M(S) Mk 8:14–21 (Lk 12:1)

speaking to you about bread? Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees.
16:12. ***Then they understood that he did not mean to beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees, but of the teaching of the Pharisees and Sadducees.***

iv. The Revelation of the Christ.

13. Now when Jesus came into the regions of Caes- M
area Philippi he asked his disciples, Who Mk 8:27–30
14. do men say ***the Son of Man*** is? They answered, Some say John the Baptist, others Elijah, others ***Jeremiah or*** one of
15. the prophets. He said to them, And who
16. do you say I am? Then Simon Peter replied, Thou art the Christ, ***the Son of the***
17. ***living God.***————Jesus answered him, P(N)
Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona, for it was not flesh and blood that revealed this
18. to thee, but my Father in heaven. And now I say to thee, Peter (Rock) is thy name, and on this rock I will build my Church; the gates of Hades will be power-
19. less against it. I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of ***heaven.*** Whatever thou (18:18)
dost prohibit on earth will have been prohibited in heaven, and whatever thou dost permit on earth will have been permitted in
20. heaven.————Then he forbade the disciples to tell anyone that he was the Christ.
21. From that time Jesus began to show his dis- M
ciples that it was ***ordained*** that he must Mk 8:31–33
go to Jerusalem and undergo great sufferings at the hands of the elders and chief priests and scribes and be killed and on the
22. third day be raised up. And Peter took him and began to reprove him for it, ***saying, God forbid, Master, this shall never befall thee.***
23. But he turned and said to Peter, Get behind me, thou Satan, ***thou art a snare to me.*** Thou takest not the view of God but of men.
24. Then Jesus said to his disciples, If any man M(S)
chooses to come after me, let him deny him- Mk 8:34–9:1
25. self, take up his cross and follow me. For (10:38 f. = Lk 14:
whoever wants to save his life will lose it, 27; 17:33)
and whoever loses his life for my sake will
26. find it. For what advantage will it be to a man to gain the whole world if he loses his

own life? Or what will a man give to buy
16:27. back his life? *For the Son of Man is about to* come in the glory of his Father attended by his angels. *Then will he requite every*
28. *man according to his works.* I give you my word, some of those that are standing here will not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom.

17:1. Six days afterward Jesus took with him Peter, M
with James and *his brother* John, and Mk 9:2–8
led them up a high mountain by them-
2. selves. And he was transfigured in their presence; *his face shone like the sun and* (13:43)
his garments were radiant like the light.
3. And lo, Moses and Elijah were manifested
4. to them talking with him. And Peter spoke up and said to Jesus, Master, it is good for us to be here. If thou approve I will put up three booths here, one for thee, one for
5. Moses and one for Elijah. Now he was still speaking when lo, a bright cloud overshadowed them, and lo, a voice came from the cloud saying, This is my Son, the Be-
6. loved, *my Chosen.* Obey ye him. *And when the disciples heard it they fell on*
7. *their faces and were greatly terrified. But Jesus came up and touched them saying,*
8. *Arise, have no fear.* And looking up they saw no one but Jesus alone.

9. And as they were going down from the moun- M
tain Jesus charged them saying, Tell the Mk 9:9–13
vision to no man till the Son of Man is
10. raised from the dead. And the disciples asked him, Why, then, do the scribes say
11. that Elijah has to come first? He answered, Elijah must indeed come and restore all
12. things. But I tell you Elijah is already come, and they did not recognize him, but worked their will on him.————So too the Son (12b tr.)
of Man is about to suffer at their hands.
13. ————*Then the disciples realized that he was speaking to them about John the Baptist.*

v. An Epileptic Healed.

14. And when they had reached the crowd a man M
came up and did him obeisance, saying, Mk 9:14–29
15. Sir, have pity on my son; he is an epileptic

and suffers cruelly. For often he falls into
17:16. the fire and often into the water. And I
brought him to thy disciples, but they could
17. not cure him. Jesus answered, O unbeliev-
ing and perverse generation, how long must
I be with you? How long have I to bear
18. with you? Bring him here to me. Then
Jesus rebuked the demon and it came out
of the boy and he was healed from that
19. hour. Then the disciples came up to Jesus
in private and said, Why could not we cast
20. it out? He said to them, ***Because of your half-belief, for I give you my word***———
——If ye could have faith as a grain of Q
mustard-seed and should say to this moun- (*Cf.* Mt 21:21M
tain, Remove hence to yonder place, it Mk 11:22 f.)
would remove, and nothing would be im-
possible to you. [21]

DIVISION B. THE DISCOURSE. CHURCH ADMINISTRATION. CHH. 17:22–18:35

i. Avoiding Occasions of Stumbling.

17:22. ***And as his adherents were mustering in*** Galilee M
Jesus said to them, The Son of Man is Mk 9:30–32
about to be delivered up into the hands
23. of men; they will kill him, but on the third
day he will be raised up. At this they were
greatly distressed.
24. ————When they reached Capernaum the P(N)
collectors of the temple half-shekel came
to Peter saying, Does not your teacher pay
25. the temple tax? He said, Yes. But when
he went indoors Jesus spoke first: Tell me,
Simon, said he, from whom do earthly kings
take customs or tribute, from their own
26. subjects or from aliens? When he said,
From aliens, Jesus replied, Then their own
27. people are exempt. However, in order
that we may avoid giving them offence,
go to the sea and cast in a hook. Take the
first fish that comes up, open its mouth,
and thou wilt find a shekel. Take that and
give it to them for me and for thyself.
18:1. ***It was at that time that*** the disciples came up M(S)
to Jesus saying, Who is greater in the Mk 9:33–37
2. kingdom of ***heaven?*** And he called up a (*Cf.* Mt 20:26 f.
3. little child, set him among them and said, I = Mk 10:43 f.)

give you my word, unless you turn and become like children you will never enter the
18:4. kingdom of ***heaven.***————Whoever therefore humbles himself ***to the level of this little child, he has*** the higher ***rank in*** R(S?) (23:12=Lk 14
5. ***the kingdom of heaven.***————And whoever receives one such little child for 11; 18:14) (10:40)
6. my sake receives me.————But whoever puts a stumbling-block in the way of one of these little ones that believe in me, it were better for him to have a great millstone hung round his neck and be sunk in the depth of the sea. M(S) Mk 9:42

7. ***Woe to the world because of stumbling-blocks.*** Obstacles must needs be met, but woe to the man through whom the stumbling Q Lk 17:1 f.
8. comes.————If thy hand ***or thy foot*** causes thee to stumble, cut it off and cast it away, M Mk 9:43–48
It is better for thee to enter into life crippled or maimed (Mt 5:29 f.)
Than keep both hands ***or feet*** and be cast into the everlasting fire.
9. And if thine eye causes thee to stumble, pluck it out and cast it away.
It is better for thee to enter into life one-eyed,
Than having two eyes to be cast into the Gehenna of fire.
10. ————Beware of despising one of these little ones. I tell you their guardian angels have unbroken access in heaven to the presence of my heavenly Father. [11] P(S?)

12. Tell me, if a man has a hundred sheep and one of them goes astray, will he not leave the ninety-nine sheep on the mountain-side Q Lk 15:3–7
13. and go in search of the stray? And if he happens to find it, I give you my word he rejoices over it more than over the ninety-
14. nine that never went astray. ***So it is not the will of your Father in heaven that one of these little ones should be lost.***

ii. Reconciliation of Brethren.

15. If thy brother sins (against thee), go and reprove him ***between you and him alone.***—— Q Lk 17:3
————If he listens to thee thou hast gained thy brother. If he will not listen, take P(O?)

along with thee one or two others, so that every case may be decided at the (Dt. 17:6)
18:17. mouth of two or three witnesses. If he will not listen to them, appeal to the church; and if he refuses to listen to the church,
18. treat him as a heathen or a tax-collector. I give you my word, Whatever you prohibit (16:19) on earth will have been prohibited in heaven, and whatever you permit on earth will have been permitted in heaven.———
19. ——Furthermore I tell you, If two of you P(O?) agree on earth about anything you pray for, it will be done for you by my Father
20. in heaven; for wherever two or three are met together in my name, there will I be (28:20) in the midst of them.
21. ***Then Peter came up and said to him, Lord how often should I forgive my brother after*** Q Lk 17:4 (*cf. Ev. Naz.*)
he has sinned against me? Up to seven
22. ***times?*** Jesus said to him, I tell thee not up to seven, but up to seventy times seven times.
23. ***For this reason the kingdom of heaven is comparable to a king*** who resolved to settle P(R?)
24. accounts with his slaves. When he began the settlement a debtor was brought to him
25. who owed him ten thousand talents. When he could not pay, the owner ordered that he and his wife and children and all his belongings should be sold, and payment be made.
26. So the slave fell on his knees before him saying, Have pity on me and I will pay
27. thee all. And the master of that slave had compassion on him and released him and
28. forgave him the entire debt. But as that slave went forth he found one of his fellow-slaves that owed him a hundred shillings, and seizing him by the throat he demanded,
29. Pay me that debt! So his fellow-slave fell at his feet and implored him, Have pity on
30. me and I will pay thee. But he would not. He went off and had him cast into prison un-
31. til he should pay the debt. And when the man's fellow-slaves knew what had happened they were greatly distressed and came and told their master everything that had
32. happened. Then his master summoned him and said, Thou wicked slave. I forgave thee

all that debt because thou didst entreat me.
18:33. Shouldest thou not have had pity on thy
34. fellow-slave as I had pity on thee? And in
hot anger the owner handed him over to
the torturers till he should have paid all that
35. was owing to him. So will my heavenly
Father also do to you unless each of you
forgive his brother from the heart.

19:1a. AND IT CAME TO PASS, WHEN JESUS HAD FINISHED THESE DISCOURSES, HE DEPARTED FROM GALILEE. R

BOOK V

CONCERNING THE JUDGMENT

"For we must all be made manifest before the judgment seat of Christ."
II Cor. 5:10

DIVISION A. JESUS IN JUDEA. CHH. 19–22

i. Teachings on the Way to the Cross.

19:1b. And he came into the borders of Judea be- M
2. yond Jordan. And great multitudes fol- Mk 10:1
lowed him, ***and he healed them there.***
3. Then the Pharisees came up to tempt him M
and said, Is it lawful for a man to divorce Mk 10:2–12
4. his wife ***for every kind of reason?*** He an-
swered, Have ye not read how He that made
them from the beginning created them
5. male and female? And He said, For this (Gen. 1:27; 2:24)
cause a man will leave his father and mother
and will cleave to his wife and the two will
6. become one flesh. Thus they are no longer
7. two, but are one flesh. They ask him, Then
why did Moses enact that before repudiat-
ing his wife a man must give her a certificate (Dt. 24:1, 3)
8. of divorce? He replied, Moses permitted
you to divorce your wives on account of the
hardness of your hearts, but it was not so
9. from the beginning. I tell you that whoever (*Cf.* 5:32)
divorces his wife ***for any reason except un-***
chastity and marries another, commits
adultery.
10. ***The disciples say to him, If the relation of a*** P(O?)
man to a woman be such it is advisable
11. ***not to marry. He answered, Not all are able***
to observe this rule. It is only for those
12. ***that have the gift; for*** ———— there are (O?S?)
eunuchs which have been such from their
birth, and there are eunuchs which have
been emasculated by men, and there are
eunuchs which have made themselves such
for the sake of the kingdom of heaven.——
———***He who can receive this, let him*** (11:14)
receive it.
13. Then were little children brought to him that M(S?)
he might lay his hands on them ***and pray*** Mk 10–13:16
for them. And the disciples checked the

19:14. people. But Jesus said to them, Let the
little children come to me, and do not hinder
them, for the kingdom of ***heaven*** belongs (18:3)
15. to the childlike. Then he laid his hands on
them and went on his way.
16. ***And lo, a man came up and said to him,*** Teacher, M
what good work must I perform to have Mk 10:17–22; *cf.*
17. eternal life? And he said to him, Why *Ev. Naz.*
askest thou me about goodness? One
alone is good. ***But if thou desirest to enter***
18. ***into life, keep the commandments. What***
commandments? said he. Jesus answered,
The scripture: Thou shalt not kill; thou (Ex. 20:12–16)
shalt not commit adultery; thou shalt not
steal; thou shalt not bear false witness;
19. honor thy father and thy mother;———
———***and thou shalt love thy neighbor as*** (R, 22:39)
20. ***thyself.***————The youth replied, I (Lev. 19:18)
have kept all these, what else is required?
21. Jesus said to him, ***If thou seekest to attain***
perfection, go, sell all thou ownest and
give the money to the poor, and thou wilt (6:20 = Lk 12:33)
have treasure in heaven; then come, fol-
22. low me. When the youth heard that he
went away grieved, for he happened to
have great possessions.
23. And Jesus said to his disciples, I give you my M
word, it is hard for a rich man to enter Mk 10:23–27
24. the kingdom of ***heaven.*** I tell you again, it
is easier for a camel to go through a needle's
eye than for a rich man to get into the king-
25. dom of ***heaven.*** And when the disciples
heard that they were completely astonished
26. and said, Who, then, can be saved? Jesus
looked at them and said, With men it is
impossible, but with God all things are
possible.
27. Then Peter spoke up and said to him, Lo, we M
have left all our belongings and followed Mk 10:28–31
28. thee; what, then, are we to receive? Jesus
said to them,————***I give you my*** (Q)
word, In the Regeneration, when the Son Lk 22:28–30
of Man has taken his seat on the " throne (Ps. 122:5)
of glory," you that have followed me shall
also sit on twelve thrones to govern the
29. twelve tribes of Israel.————And
everyone that has left brethren or sisters
or father or mother, or children or lands

or houses for my name's sake will receive
many times as much and will inherit eternal
19:30. life. But many that are first will be last, M (S?)
and the last first. Lk 13:30
20:1. For the kingdom of ***heaven*** is like a house- P(S?)
holder who went forth early in the morning
2. to hire laborers for his vineyard; and after
agreeing with the laborers to pay them a
shilling a day he sent them into his vine-
3. yard. And about the third hour he came
forth and saw other laborers standing in
4. the market place unemployed. And he
said to them, Do you also go into my vine-
yard, and I will pay you whatever is right.
5. So they went. Going out again at noon and
6. at the ninth hour he did likewise. And
when at the eleventh hour he came out
and found still others standing he saith to
them, Why have you stood here idle all the
7. day long? They say to him, Because no
man has hired us. He answered, Do you too
8. go into my vineyard. And when night fell
the owner of the vineyard said to his over-
seer, Call the workmen and pay them their
wages, beginning with the last and so on
9. to the first. When those came who had been
hired about the eleventh hour they received
10. a shilling each. So when the first laborers
came they supposed they would get more,
11. but they too received each his shilling. And
when they had received it they began to
12. murmur against the householder saying,
These last have worked but a single hour,
and thou hast ranked them equal to us who
have borne the brunt of the day and its
13. heat! But he took up one of them and said,
My man, I do thee no injustice; didst thou
14. not agree with me for a shilling? Pick up
that coin that belongs to thee and begone.
I choose to give this last man the same as
15. to thee. May I not do as I please with what
belongs to me? Art thou envious because R(S?)
16. I am generous? ***Thus the last shall be first*** Mk 10:31; Lk
and the first last. 13:30
17. Now as Jesus was about to go up to Jerusa- M
lem he took aside the twelve privately and Mk 10:32–34
18. said to them on the journey, Lo, we are
going up to Jerusalem, and the Son of Man

will be delivered up to the chief priests and scribes, and they will condemn him to death
20:19. and hand him over to the Gentiles to be mocked and crucified, and the third day he will be raised to life.

20. Then *the mother of* the sons of Zebedee came M
up to him *with her sons,* and making obei- Mk 10:35–40
21. sance asked of him a favor. He said to *her,* What dost thou ask? *She* says to him, Give direction that *these two sons of mine* may sit one at thy right hand and
22. one at thy left in thy kingdom. Jesus replied, You do not know what you are asking for. Are you able to drink the cup that I am about to drink? They said to him,
23. We can. He says to them, You shall indeed drink my cup, but a seat on my right hand or my left is not mine to give; it belongs to those for whom it has been prepared by my Father.

24. And when the ten heard of it they were angry M(S?)
25. with the two brothers. But Jesus called Mk 10:41–45
them up and said, You know how the (Lk 22:24–27)
rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them,
26. and their great ones oppress them. It must not be so with you. Whoever desires to be great among you must be your servant,
27. and whoever wants to be first among you
28. must be your slave, just as the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and to (Mk 14:24)
give his life as a ransom for many.

ii. Rejection in Jerusalem.

29. As they were leaving Jericho a great crowd M
30. followed him, and lo, *two* blind men, sitting Mk 10:46–52
by the roadside, when *they* heard that Jesus (*cf.* Mt 9:27 f.;
was passing cried out saying, Have pity on 12:22)
31. *us,* thou Son of David! The crowd checked *them,* bidding *them* be silent. But *they* cried out all the more, *Lord,* pity *us,* thou
32. Son of David! So Jesus stopped and called *them,* saying, What do *ye* wish me to do
33. for *you? They* say to him, Lord, that *our*
34. eyes should be opened. *Moved with compassion Jesus touched their eyes,* and forthwith they regained their sight and followed him. (Mk 8:22 f.)

21:1. And when they came near to Jerusalem and M(N)

had reached Bethphage on the Mount of Mk 11:1–10
21:2. Olives, Jesus despatched two disciples saying to them, Go to the village opposite and you will find forthwith an ass tethered *with a colt alongside of her.* Untie *them*
3. and bring *them* to me. If anyone says anything to you, say, The Lord needs them; *then he will* let them go at once.————
4. This took place that the word spoken by (N)
the prophet might meet fulfilment,
5. *Tell ye the daughter of Zion,* (Is. 62:11 LXX)
Lo, thy king cometh unto thee, (Zech. 9:9 Hebr.)
Meek and mounted on an ass,
And on a colt the foal of an ass.
6. ————So the disciples went and did
7. just as Jesus had commanded them. They brought the ass *and the colt* and put their garments on *them,* and Jesus seated
8. himself thereon. And most of the crowd spread their garments on the road, while others cut *branches from the trees* and
9. strewed them on the road. And the crowds that preceded and those that followed behind shouted,
Hosannah (" save, we pray ") *to the Son* (Ps. 118; 25 f.;
of David. *cf.* Mk 11:10)
Blessed is he that comes in Jehovah's name!
Hosannah in high heaven!
10. When he came into Jerusalem *the whole*
11. *city was stirred, saying, Who is this? And the crowds replied, This is the prophet Jesus from Nazareth in Galilee.*
12. Then Jesus went into the temple of God and M
drove out all that were buying and sell- Mk 11:11, 15–19
ing in the temple; he overturned the tables of the money-changers and the stalls of
13. the dove-sellers and said to them, It is written " My house shall be called a house (Is. 56:7)
of prayer," but ye make it a " den of (Jer. 7:11)
thieves."
14. And the blind and the lame came up to him P(R, S?)
15. in the temple and he healed them. But when the chief priests and scribes saw the wonders that he performed and the children shouting in the temple, Hosannah to the Son of
16. David, they were indignant and said to him, Hearest thou what these are saying? And

Jesus says to them, Yes; did you never read the scripture, From the mouth of babes and sucklings Thou hast won perfect praise? (Ps. 8:3, LXX)

21:17. ————Then he left them and went forth out of the city to Bethany ***where he made his lodging.*** M

18. In the morning as he was returning to the city M(S)
19. he felt hungry, and seeing a fig tree by the roadside he went up to it, but found nothing on it but leaves. So he says to it, Let there be no fruit from thee hereafter forever! And instantly the fig tree withered
20. away. And when the disciples saw it they marvelled saying, How is it that the fig
21. tree suddenly withered? Jesus took them up and said to them, I give you my word, If ye have faith ***and do not doubt, you will not only do what was done to the fig tree, but*** even if you should say to this mountain, Be lifted up and cast into the sea it would
22. be done. Whatever things you ask in prayer if you believe you will receive them. Mk. 11:12—14, 20–24 S (17:20 = Lk 17:6) (18:15 = Lk 17:3 f.)

23. And when he had come into the temple and was teaching there came up to him the chief priests and elders of the people saying, By what authority doest thou these things? M Mk 11:27–33
24. Who gave thee this authority? And Jesus answered them, I too will ask you a single question, which if you answer I also will tell you by what authority I do these things.
25. Whence came the baptism of John? Was that from heaven, or from men? So they argued with one another saying, If we say, From heaven, he will say to us, Why, then,
26. did ye not believe him? But if we say, From men, we fear the crowd, for all men consider
27. John to have been a prophet. So they answered Jesus, We do not know. He in turn replied to them, No more will I tell you what authority I have for acting as I do.

28. ————Tell me what you think. A man had two sons. He approached the first and said, Son, go work today in my vine-
29. yard. He answered, I will not; but afterwards he changed his mind and went. He
30. came to the second and said the same to him. His answer was, I will, sir. But he
31. did not go. Which of the two did the will of Q? Lk 15:11–32

his father? They say to him, The first. Jesus said to them, I give you my word, the tax-collectors and harlots are going into the kingdom of God before you.———

21:32. For John came to you teaching a way of salvation, and you put no faith in him. But the tax-collectors and harlots put faith in him, while you, on your part, did not even change your minds afterwards to put faith in him. Q Lk 7:29 f.

33. ***Hear another parable.*** There was a householder who planted a vineyard, put a wall around it, dug a winevat in it, and built a watch-tower. Then he leased it to vine-
34. dressers and went abroad. When vintage season came he sent his slaves to the vine-
35. dressers to collect his share of the crop. But the vine-dressers took his slaves and beat one, killed another, and stoned a third.
36. Again he sent other slaves in greater number than the first, and they treated them in
37. the same way. Finally he sent his son to them, saying, They will respect my son.
38. But when the vine-dressers saw his son they said to themselves, This is the heir. Come on, let us kill him and seize his in-
39. heritance! So they seized him, dragged him out of the vineyard and killed him.
40. Well, then, when the owner of the vineyard comes what will he do to those vine-
41. dressers? They replied, He will put the wretches to a wretched death and will lease the vineyard to other vine-dressers who will pay him his share of the crop in due season.
42. Jesus says to them, Did you never read in the Scriptures,

M(S?) Mk 12:1–12 (23:37–39 = Lk 13:34 f.)

> The stone that the builders rejected
> Has been made the chief corner-stone:
> This corner-stone came from Jehovah,
> And is marvellous in our eyes.

(Ps. 118:22 f.)

43. For this reason I tell you, The kingdom of God will be taken away from you and given
45. to a nation that produces its fruits. [44] And when ***the chief priests and the Pharisees had heard his parables*** they realized that
46. he was speaking about them; so they ***tried to seize him but*** were afraid of the crowds, for the crowds considered him to be a prophet.

22:1. *Then Jesus again addressed them in parables,* Q
2. *saying, The kingdom of heaven may be* Lk 14:16–24
compared to a king who made a *marriage-*
3. feast *for his son.* He sent his slaves to
summon the guests invited *to the wed-*
4. *ding, but they would not come. Again he*
sent other slaves saying, *Tell the invited*
guests, Lo, my banquet is ready, my oxen
and fat cattle are slaughtered, all prepara-
5. tions are made, come *to the wedding.* But
they paid no heed but went off, one to his
farm, another to his shop.————*And*
6. *the rest seized his slaves and abused and* R
7. *killed them. So the king was angry and*
sent his armies and destroyed those
murderers and burnt their city.————
8. Then he says to his slaves, *The wedding*
feast is ready, but the invited guests were
9. *unworthy. Therefore* go to the partings of
the roads and invite all comers *to the*
10. *wedding. So the slaves went forth into*
the streets and gathered all that they found,
both bad and good, and the wedding was
11. supplied with guests.————Now when
the king came in to inspect the banqueters P(R, O?)
he espied there a man not clothed with a (13:36–43, 47–50)
12. wedding garment, and says to him, My man,
how came you in here without a wedding
13. garment? And he was speechless. Then the
king said to the servants, Bind him hand
and foot and *cast him out into the darkness*
outside. In that place there will be wailing
14. *and gnashing of teeth.* For " many are in- O?
vited but few are chosen."

iii. Debates in the Temple.

15. Then the Pharisees went away and laid a plot M
16. to trap him in his talk. They send to him Mk 12:13–17
their disciples together with the Hero-
dians, who said, Teacher, we know that thou
art sincere and teachest the way of God in
truth, and hast no fear of any man, for thou
17. dost not court human favor. Tell us, then,
thy judgment about this: Is it lawful or not
18. to pay the poll-tax to Caesar? But Jesus
saw through their malignity and said, Why
do you lay traps for me, you hypocrites?
19. Show me the coin for taxes. So they brought

22:20. him a shilling. And Jesus says to them,
Whose likeness is this? Whose is this in-
21. scription? They say, Caesar's. Then said he
to them, Render to Caesar what belongs to
Caesar, and to God what belongs to God.
22. When they heard that they marvelled; *so
they left him and went away.*
23. The same day Sadducees approached him, M
men who hold that there is no resurrection. Mk 12:18–27
24. They put this question to him: Teacher,
Moses said, If a man die childless his (Dt. 25:5)
brother must espouse his widow and raise
25. up offspring for his brother. We had a case
of seven brothers. The first married and
died; having no children he left his wife to
26. his brother. The same happened to the
second and the third, down to the seventh.
27/28. After all the rest the woman died. Well, then,
at the resurrection whose wife will she be?
29. They all had her. Jesus answered them, You
go wrong because you understand neither
30. the Scriptures nor the power of God. At the
resurrection there is neither marrying nor
giving in marriage, men are like the angels
31. of God in heaven. But as for the resurrec-
tion of the dead, have you not read the
32. promise spoken to you by God: I am the (Ex. 3:6)
God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and
the God of Jacob? He is not a God of dead
33. ghosts, but of a living people. And when
the crowds heard it they marvelled at his
teaching.
34. *But the Pharisees, when they heard that he* M
had silenced the Sadducees, mustered Mk 12:28–34
35. *their forces, and one of their number who
was* a lawyer put a question to him *to*
36. *tempt him, Teacher,* what is the supreme
37. command in the Law? And he said to him,
The command, Thou shalt love the Lord (Dt. 6:5)
thy God with thy whole heart, and with
thy whole soul, and with thy whole mind.
38. This is the first and greatest commandment.
39. There is a second which is like it, Thou (Lev. 19:18)
40. shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. *All the* R
*Law and the prophets hang upon these two
commands.*
41. And *while the Pharisees were gathered to-* M
42. *gether* Jesus put a question to them say- Mk 12:35–37

ing, Tell me what you think about the Christ. Whose son is he? They replied,
22:43. David's. He said to them, How is it, then, that David under inspiration calls him Lord, saying,
44. Jehovah said to my Lord, Sit at my right hand, (Ps. 110:1)
Till I put thine enemies under thy feet.
45. If, then, David calls him Lord how can he
46. be his son?————*And no man could* R
give him answer to this question, nor did anyone venture to ask him anything further.

DIVISION B. DISCOURSE ON JUDGMENT TO COME

i. Woes on Scribes and Pharisees. Ch. 23.

23:1. Then Jesus made a discourse to the crowds R
2. and to his disciples saying: The scribes and
3. Pharisees occupy Moses' seat, therefore whatever they tell you do and observe it, but do not follow their practice, for they talk but do not act accordingly.————
4. They invent heavy obligations and impose them on men's shoulders, but themselves lift not a finger to remove them.—— Q (Lk 11:46)
5. ———All their actions are performed to catch the notice of men. They make their phylacteries broad and wear large tassels, R
6. ————they claim the best seats at M(S)
banquets and the places of honor in the Mk 12:38–40
7. synagogues and greetings in the market- (Lk 11:43–46)
places————and to be called Rabbi by R
8. men. But you are not to be called Rabbi, for one alone is your Teacher, and all of
9. you are brothers. You are not to call any one upon earth Father, for One alone is
10. your heavenly Father; nor must you be called Leaders, for one alone, the Christ, is
11. your Leader.————He that is greater Q
among you must be your servant.——— (Lk 9:48b)
12. ——Whoever exalts himself shall be hum- (18:4=Lk 14:11)
bled, and whoever humbles himself shall be exalted.
13. Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, Q
for you shut the kingdom of *heaven* in Lk 11:52
men's faces; you neither enter yourselves, nor will you allow those to enter who are about to do so. [14]
15. Woe to you scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites; P(R?)

for you travel about sea and land to make a single proselyte, and when he is won you make him twice as much a son of Gehenna as yourselves.

23:16. Woe to you, blind guides that you are! You say, If a man swears by the sanctuary it does not signify, but if he swears by the gold 17. of the sanctuary the oath is binding. Fools and blind! For which is greater, the gold, or the sanctuary that makes the gold sacred? 18. Again you say, If a man swears by the altar it does not signify, but if he swears by the 19. offering upon it the oath is binding. You blind! For which is greater, offering, or the 20. altar that makes the offering sacred? So, then, he who swears by the altar swears by 21. it and by all that lies on it; and he that swears by the temple swears by it and by 22. Him whose dwelling it is; he who swears by heaven swears by the throne of God and by Him who sits upon it. P(R?)

23. ————Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites; for while you tithe mint and anise and cummin you pass by the weightier commands of the Law, justice and mercy and good faith. These you should have done without neglecting the other. Q Lk 11:39–42, 44, 47 f.

24. ————*Blind guides that you are, "filtering out a gnat and swallowing a camel!"* R(O?)

25. Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites; for you cleanse the outside of cup and plate, but their contents are obtained 26. by your rapacity and greed. Thou blind Pharisee, cleanse first the contents of the cup, that the outside of it may be pure also. Q Lk 11:39–41

27. Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites; for you are like whitewashed tombs; *outwardly they present a fine appearance while inwardly they are full of dead men's 28. bones and all manner of impurity. So you too appear outwardly in men's eyes to be righteous, but inwardly you are full of hypocrisy and lawlessness.* Q Lk 11:44

29. Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites; for you build tombs for the prophets and decorate the sepulchres of the saints, 30. saying, If we had lived in the days of our fathers we would not have joined with them Q Lk 11:47 f.

23:31. in shedding the blood of the prophets. Thus
you bear witness against yourselves that
you are sons of those who killed the
32. prophets.————*You, too, fill up the* R
33. *measure of your fathers' wickedness; you* (3:7; 12:34)
serpents, you brood of vipers, how can you
escape the sentence to Gehenna?

34. *On this account,* Q
Lo, I send to you prophets and sages and Lk 11:49f.; 13:
scribes; 34f. quoting "the
Some of them ye will kill and crucify, Wisdom of God";
Some ye will scourge in your synagogues, *cf.* I Clem. 57
And persecute from city to city.

35. That you might be found guilty for all the
just blood shed upon earth,
From the blood of Abel the saint (Gen. 4:3; II
Down to the blood of Zechariah *son of* Chron. 24:20 f.;
Barachiah, *cf. Ev. Naz.*)
Whom you slew between temple and altar.

36. I give you my word it will all be visited on (R^s?)
this generation.

37. Jerusalem, Jerusalem! murderess of the
prophets
And stoner of the messengers sent to her!
How often did I seek to gather thy
children,
As a mother-bird gathers her nestlings
under her wings!

38. But you would not have it! See, "your (R^s?)
House is left to you forsaken;" for I tell (Jer. 12:7; 22:5)
39. you, You shall see me no more, till you cry,
"Blessed be the messenger who comes in (Ps. 118:26)
Jehovah's name."

ii. The Doom of Jerusalem. Ch. 24.

24:1. Then Jesus left the temple and went on his M
way. And his disciples came up to show Mk 13:1 f.
2. him the temple buildings, but he replied to
them, You see all this? I give you my word,
there will not be left here one stone upon
another that will not be overthrown.
3. Now as he was sitting on the Mount of Olives M
the disciples came up to him in private Mk 13:3 f.

and said, Tell us, when will this happen? What will be the sign of thy Coming and of the consummation of the world?

(a) Birthpangs of the Christ

24:4. And Jesus gave them this answer: Beware lest — M(S)
5. any man lead you astray; for many will — Mk 13:5–8
come in my name saying, I am ***the Christ,*** — Lk 17:23
6. and will lead many astray. You will hear
of wars and rumors of wars. Take heed
not to be agitated, for this must needs take
7. place, but the end will not be yet. For na-
tion will rise against nation and kingdom
against kingdom; there will be famines and
8. earthquakes in various places. All these
are the beginning of the birthpangs.
9. Then they will hand you over to affliction, — M(S)
and will kill you, and you will be hated by — Mk 13:9–13
all the Gentiles on account of my name. — (Mt 10:17–22)
10. Many at that time will be driven to recant
and they will betray one another and hate
11. one another. Many false prophets will arise
and lead many astray.————***And be-***
12. ***cause of the increase of lawlessness in*** — R
most of you love will grow cold;————
13. but he that holds out to the end will be
14. saved.————And this gospel of the — M
kingdom will be preached throughout the — Mk 13:10
whole world for a witness against all the
Gentiles, ***thereafter the end will come.***

(b) The Great Tribulation

15. So when you see the Abomination that makes — M(S)
desolate ***spoken of by the prophet Daniel*** — Mk 13:14–20
standing ***in a holy place*** (let the reader
16. note this), then let those in Judea flee to — (Lk 17:31)
17. the mountains. Let a man on his house-
top not go down to save the things in
18. his house, and a man in the field not turn
19. back to get his coat. Woe to the women — (Lk 23:28 f.)
with child and to those that are nursing
20. children in those days. And pray that your
flight may not be in winter ***nor on a sab-***
21. ***bath.*** For at that time there will be great
affliction such as has never been from the — (Dan. 12:1)
beginning of the world until now; no, and
22. never shall be. And if those days had not — (Is. 10:23 *cf.*
been cut short no flesh would have been — Rom. 9:28)

saved, but for the elect's sake those days
will be cut short.
24:23. Then, if anyone tells you, Lo, here is the Christ!
24. or, Lo, there he is! do not believe it; for M(S)
false Christs and false prophets will arise Mk 13:21–23
and produce great signs and wonders, so as (Lk 17:23 f., 37)
to mislead even the elect, if that were pos-
25. sible. Lo, I have told you in advance.——
26. ———If, therefore, they say to you, Lo, Q
he is in the wilderness, go not forth; lo, Lk 17:23 f., 37
27. he is in the chamber, believe it not, For
as the lightning flashes from east to west,
so will be the Coming of the Son of Man.
28. ————For "wherever the carcase lies, (Job 39:30)
there will the vultures gather."

(c) Coming of the Judge

29. But forthwith after the affliction of those M
days Mk 13:24–27
The sun will be darkened, (Is. 13:10)
And the moon will not give her light,
The stars will drop from heaven, (Is. 34:4)
And the Powers of the heavens will be (Hg. 2:21)
shaken.
30. ***Then the Sign of the Son of Man will ap-*** (Zech. 12:10–14)
pear in the skies, and all tribes on earth
will mourn, and they will see the Son of Man (Dan. 7:13 f.)
coming on the clouds of heaven with power
31. and great glory. And he will send out his (Is. 27:13)
angels ***with a great trumpet-call*** to muster
his elect from the four winds, from one hori- (Dt. 30:4, LXX)
zon to the other.
32. Let the fig tree teach you a parable. When M(S)
its twigs become tender and put forth leaves Mk 13:28–32
33. you know that summer is at hand; so also,
when you see all these things taking place,
you will know that he is at hand, at the very
34. door. I give you my word, the present gen- (16:28=Mk 9:1
eration will not pass away till all these things =Lk 9:27)
35. come to pass. Heaven and earth will pass (5:17=Lk 16:17)
away, but my words will never pass away.
36. But as concerning that day and hour no
man has knowledge, not even the angels in
heaven nor the Son, but the Father alone.
37. ————Only, the Coming of the Son Q
of Man will be just as happened in the Lk 17:26 f., 34 f.
38. days of Noah. For as in the days before
the flood men were eating and drinking,

marrying and giving in marriage until the
24:39. day came that Noah entered the ark; and as
they knew nothing till the flood came and
swept them all away, so also will be the
40. Coming of the Son of Man. Then there
will be two men in the field, one will be
41. taken and the other left; two women will
be grinding at the millstone, one will be
42. taken and the other left.————Therefore watch, because you know not what day your Lord may come. M Mk 13:35

(d) Be Watchful

43. This, however, you do know; that if the householder had known in what watch of the night the thief would come, he would have been on his guard and not have per- Q Lk 12:39 f.
44. mitted his house to be broken into. For this reason do you too be ready, for in an hour that you expect not the Son of Man will come.
45. Who, then, is the faithful and thoughtful slave whom his master sets over his household to give to all their supplies at the proper Q Lk 12:42–46
46. time? That slave is happy whom his master
47. finds so doing when he arrives. I give you my word, he will entrust all his property to
48. him. But if the bad slave says to himself,
49. My master is long in coming, if he begins to beat his fellow-slaves, and to eat and
50. drink with drunkards, the master of that slave will come on a day that he does not expect, and at an hour that he does not
51. know. He will cut him asunder [1] and assign his portion with the ***hypocrites.***———— ***In that place there will be wailing and gnashing of teeth.***

iii. The Consummation. Ch. 25.

(a) Wisdom and Folly

25:1. Then the kingdom of ***heaven*** will be comparable to ten maidens who took their lamps and went out to meet the bridegroom. R(S) (Lk 12:35 f.)
2. Five of them were foolish and five prudent.
3. For the foolish took their lamps, but no sup-

[1] A misrendering in Q (Mt 24:51 = Lk 12:46) of the Semitic expression "will cut his portion"; *cf.* Is. 53:12.

25:4. ply of oil with them. But the prudent took
5. oil in their vessels with their lamps. And
when the bridegroom was long in coming
6. they all grew drowsy and fell asleep. And
at midnight the cry was raised, Lo, the
bridegroom is coming, come out to meet
7. him! Then all the maidens rose and trimmed
8. their lamps. And the foolish said to the
prudent, Give us of your oil, for our lamps
9. are going out. But the prudent replied, No;
for there may not be enough for us and you
too; better go to the dealers and buy for
10. yourselves. And while they were gone to
buy the bridegroom came, and those that
were ready went in with him to the marriage
feast. And the door was shut.————
11. Afterwards came the other maidens say- (Lk 13:25)
ing, Oh sir, oh sir, open the door for us!
12. but he replied, I give you my word I do not
13. know you.————Therefore keep on (Mk 13:33)
the watch, for you do not know either the
day or the hour.

(b) Entrusted Funds

14. For the case is like that of a man going abroad, S
who summoned his slaves and entrusted (Mk 13:34–36 =
15. his property to them. To one he gave Lk 19:12–27)
five thousand dollars, to another two,
to another one, each according to his capac-
16. ity. Then he went abroad. Forthwith the
one who had received the five thousand
went and traded with it and made five
17. thousand more. Likewise he that had the
18. two gained two more. But he that received
the one thousand went off and dug a hole
in the ground and hid the money belonging
19. to his master. Now a long time afterwards
the master of those slaves came back and
20. settled accounts with them. So he who had
received the five thousand dollars came for-
ward and brought the other five thousand
saying, Master, thou gavest me five thou-
sand dollars, Lo, I have gained five thou-
21. sand dollars more. His master said to him,
Well done, thou excellent and loyal slave!
Thou hast been faithful in charge of a small
sum, I will put thee in charge of a large sum.
22. Come and share thy master's feast. Then

the one that had the two thousand came
up and said, Master, thou deliveredst to me
two thousand dollars; see, I have gained
25:23. two thousand more. His master says to him,
Well done, thou excellent and loyal slave!
Thou hast been faithful in charge of a small
sum, I will put thee in charge of a large
sum. Come and share thy master's feast.
24. Then he that had received the one thousand
dollars came up and said, Master, I knew
thee to be a hard man. Thou reapest where
thou didst not sow, and gatherest where
25. thou didst not scatter. So I was afraid, and
went and hid thy thousand dollars in the
ground; lo, here is that which belongs to
26. thee. His master said to him in reply, Thou
rascally and idle slave! So thou knewest
that I reap where I did not sow and gather
27. where I did not scatter! Well then, thou
shouldst have given my money to the
bankers, and when I came back I would
28. have got my capital with interest. Take
away from him, then, the thousand dollars
and give it to him who has the five thou-
29. sand.————For to every one that has (Mk 4:25=Mt
shall more be given unto superabundance; 13:12=Lk 8:18)
but from him that has nothing even what
30. he has will be taken away. ***And cast out
the worthless slave into the darkness out-
side, in that place there will be wailing
and gnashing of teeth.***

(c) The Judgment of the World

31. When the Son of Man comes in his glory, and R(S)
all the angels with him, then he will take (Mk 9:37, 41) Lk
32. his seat on the throne of his glory and 10:16
all nations will be gathered in his presence,
and he will separate men one from another
as a shepherd separates sheep from goats.
33. And he will set the sheep on his right hand
34. but the goats on his left. Then the King will
say to those on his right: Come, you whom
my Father has blessed, inherit the kingdom
prepared for you from the foundation of
35. the world. For I was hungry and you fed
36. me, thirsty and you gave me drink; I was
naked and you clothed me, sick and you
looked after me, I was in prison and you

25:37. visited me. Then the justified will answer,
Lord, when did we see thee hungry and fed
38. thee, or thirsty and gave thee drink? When
did we see thee a stranger and gave thee
39. shelter, or naked and clothed thee? When
did we see thee sick or in prison and vis-
40. ited thee? And the King will answer them,
I give you my word, in so far as you did
it to one of these brothers of mine, even
41. the least, you did it to me. Then he will say
to those on his left, Begone from me, you
accursed ones, to the eternal fire prepared
42. for the devil and his angels! For I was
hungry and you gave me no food, thirsty,
43. and you gave me nothing to drink. I was a
stranger, but you entertained me not, I was
naked but you clothed me not, I was sick
44. and in prison, but you visited me not. Then
they too will answer: Lord, when did we
ever see thee hungry or thirsty or a stranger
or naked or sick or in prison and failed to
45. minister to thee? And he will answer them,
I give you my word, in so far as you failed
to minister to one of these, even the least of
46. them, you failed of doing it to me. These
will go away to eternal punishment, but the
just to eternal life.

26:1. AND IT CAME TO PASS, WHEN JESUS HAD FINISHED ALL THESE DISCOURSES HE SAID TO HIS DISCIPLES, YOU KNOW THAT IN TWO DAYS MORE THE PASSOVER COMES AND THE SON OF MAN WILL BE DELIVERED UP TO BE CRUCIFIED. R(M) (Mk 14:1)

THE EPILOGUE

CHH. 26–28

"He became obedient unto death. Therefore God has highly exalted him and given him the Name which is above every Name." Phil. 2:8 f.

i. The Plot to Kill Jesus.

26:3. Then the chief priests and elders of the people M
met in the palace of the high priest, ***whose*** Mk 14:1 f.
4. ***surname was Caiaphas,*** and took counsel
together to seize Jesus by craft and have
5. him put to death. Only, they said, it must
not be during the festival, lest there be a
tumult among the people.
6. Now while Jesus was in Bethany, in the house M
7. of Simon the leper,[1] a woman came up Mk 14:3–9
to him with an alabaster flask of costly
perfumed oil and poured it on his head as
8. he reclined at table. When the disciples
saw this they were angry and said, What
9. was the use of this waste? This ointment
might have been sold for a large sum and
10. the money given to the poor. But Jesus
realized what they were saying, and replied, Why do you annoy the woman? She
11. has done a noble thing for my benefit. The
poor you will always have near you, but you
12. will not always have me. For she, in pouring
this perfume on my body, has performed an
13. act appropriate to my burial. I give you
my word, Wherever this gospel is preached
in the whole world what this woman has
done shall also be told as a memorial to her.
14. Then one of the twelve called Judas Iscariot M
15. went to the chief priests and said, What Mk14: 10 f.
will you give me if I deliver him up to you?
And they weighed out ***thirty pieces of silver*** (Zech. 11:12
16. for him. So from that time on he sought a LXX)
good opportunity to betray him.

ii. The Farewell Supper.

17. Now on the first day of Unleavened Bread the M
disciples of Jesus came up to him and said, Mk 14:12–16
Where dost thou wish us to make the

[1] Perhaps a translation error for " the jar-maker, " a word resembling that translated " leper " in Aramaic.

preparations for thee to eat the Passover?
26:18. And he said, Go into the city to so-and-so;
tell him: The Teacher says, My time is near,
I must eat the Passover at thy house with
19. my disciples. So the disciples did as Jesus
directed and made ready the Passover.
20. And when evening came he took his place with M
21. the disciples; and as they were eating he Mk 14:17–21
said: I give you my word, there is one of
22. you who is going to betray me. And greatly
distressed at this they began to say to him
23. each in turn, Surely it is not I, Master? He
answered, One who has dipped his hand in
the same dish with me is going to betray
24. me. The Son of Man must indeed go the
road the Scripture has laid out for him, but
woe to that man through whom the Son of
Man is delivered up. It were better for
that man if he had never been born.———
25. ——*Judas, who betrayed him, said, Surely* R
it is not I, Rabbi? He saith to him, That is
for thee to say.
26. And as they were eating Jesus took bread and M
pronouncing the (ritual) blessing broke Mk 14:22–25
it and gave to the disciples, saying, Take
27. and eat this, it represents my body. And
he took a cup and pronouncing the blessing
gave it to them saying, All of you drink of
28. this, for it represents my blood, blood of the
covenant, shed for many *for the forgiveness*
29. *of sins.* I tell you, from henceforth I shall
no more drink of this "fruit of the vine" [2]
till that day come when I shall drink it new
with you in the kingdom of *my Father.*

iii. Gethsemane.

30. And when they had sung the hymn [3] they went M
31. forth to the Mount of Olives. Then Jesus Mk 14:26–31
said to them: All of you will desert me
tonight, for it is written, I will smite the (Zech. 13:7)
shepherd and the sheep of the flock will be
32. scattered. But after I have been raised up
33. I will go before you to Galilee. Peter an-
swered, Even if all should desert thee, I
34. will never desert thee. Jesus says to him, I

[2] A phrase from the blessing of the cup at the "sanctification" of Passover and other festivals.

[3] The *Hallel* (Ps. 118) sung at Passover; *cf.* 21:9.

give thee my word, This very night, before
the cock crows, thou wilt disown me three
26:35. times. Peter says to him, Even if I have to
die with thee I will never disown thee. ***All
the disciples gave him the same assurance.***
36. Then Jesus comes with them to a plot of ground M
called Gethsemane and told the disciples, Mk 14:32–42
Sit here while I go over yonder and pray.
37. And he took with him Peter and the two
sons of Zebedee, and beginning to feel
38. distressed and agitated he says to them,
My heart is sad, sad even to death; stay
39. here and keep watch with me. And advanc-
ing a little way he fell on his face to pray,
saying, Father, if it be possible let this cup
pass by me. Nevertheless not as I will, but
40. as thou wilt. Then he came back to the
disciples and found them asleep; and he
said to Peter, So you could not keep watch
41. with me a single hour? Watch and pray
lest you fall into trial. Your spirit is eager,
42. but the flesh is weak. Again the second
time he went away and prayed ***saying, My
Father, if this cup cannot pass unless I***
43. ***drink it, thy will be done.*** And when he
returned he found them asleep again, for
44. their eyes were heavy. ***So he left them,
and returning prayed for the third time***
45. ***saying the same words again.*** Then he
comes to the disciples and says to them,
Are you still sleeping on and taking your
rest? Lo, the hour is near that the Son of
Man is delivered up into the hands of sin-
46. ners. Rise up, let us be going, lo, my be-
trayer is close at hand.
47. While he was still speaking Judas, one of the M
twelve, approached, and with him a great Mk 14:43–49
crowd armed with swords and clubs from
the chief priests and elders of the people.
48. Now his betrayer had given them a signal
saying, Whoever I kiss, that is the man;
49. seize him. So forthwith he went up to
Jesus saying, Hail, Rabbi, and kissed him.
50. ***But Jesus said to him, My man, do your*** R
errand. Then the men came up and laid M
51. hands on Jesus and arrested him. And
lo, one of Jesus' companions put out his
hand, drew a sword, and striking the slave

of the high priest cut off his ear.————

26:52. Then Jesus says to him, Put thy sword back in its place, for all who draw the 53. sword will die by the sword. What! dost thou suppose that I cannot call upon my Father to supply me on the spot with more 54. than twelve legions of angels? Only, how, then, would the scriptures be fulfilled which 55. require this to take place?————At that hour Jesus said to the crowds: Have you come forth to take me with swords and clubs like a robber? Day after day I sat in the temple teaching and you did not 56. arrest me. But this has all happened that the prophetic scriptures might be fulfilled. R(N?)

iv. Trial before Caiaphas.

Then all the disciples deserted him and fled; M

57. and the men who had arrested Jesus took him away to the house of ***Caiaphas*** the high priest, where the scribes and elders had 58. gathered. But Peter followed him at a distance as far as the courtyard of the high priest, and when he got inside he sat down with the retainers ***to see the end.*** Mk 14:50, 53 f.

59. Now the chief priests and the whole Sanhedrin sought false evidence against Jesus to have 60. him put to death; but they found nothing, though many false witnesses came for- 61. ward. At last two came up and said, This man declared, I ***can*** destroy the temple 62. ***of God*** and build it again in three days. So the high priest rose up and said to him, Hast thou no reply to make to what these 63. witness against thee? But Jesus was silent. Then the high priest addressed him: ***I adjure thee by the living God to tell us whether*** thou art the Christ the Son of 64. God. Jesus saith to him: ***That is for thee to say;*** only I tell you, from now you will see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of the (heavenly) Power and coming upon the 65. clouds of heaven. Then the high priest tore his garment saying, He has blasphemed; what further need have we of witnesses? Lo, you heard the blasphemy just now. 66. What is your judgment? They answered, 67. He is amenable to death. Then they spat M Mk 14:55–65 (Ps. 110:1; Dan. 7:13)

26:68. in his face and cuffed him, and some that buffeted him cried, Prophesy to us, ***you Christ! Tell us who struck you!***

69. Now Peter was sitting outside in the court- M
yard; and a certain maidservant came up Mk 14:66–72
to him and said, Thou too wert with Jesus
70. the Galilean. But he denied it in the pres-
ence of all, saying, I know not what thou
71. meanest. When he had gone out into the
gateway another maidservant noticed him
and said to the bystanders, This fellow was
72. with Jesus the Nazarene. Again he denied
it, saying with an oath, I do not know the
73. man. But after a little the bystanders
came up and said to Peter, Surely thou also
wert one of them; indeed ***thine accent be-***
74. ***trayeth thee.*** Then he began to curse and
swear, I do not know the man. At that
75. moment a cock crowed, and Peter remem-
bered the word spoken by Jesus, Before the
cock crows thou wilt disown me three times.
And he ***went outside*** and wept bitterly.

v. Trial before Pilate.

27:1. When morning came all the chief priests and M
elders of the people took counsel against Mk 15:1 f.
2. Jesus to get him put to death. Then they
bound him, led him away, and handed him
over to Pilate the governor.

3. Then Judas his betrayer, when he saw that he P(N?)
had been condemned, was remorseful and
brought back the thirty pieces of silver
4. to the chief priests and elders saying, I did
wrong to betray innocent blood. They re-
plied, What does that matter to us; it is
5. thy affair. So he flung down the pieces of
silver in the temple and went off and hanged
6. himself. But the chief priests when they
had received the money, said, It would not
be right to put this into the treasury, for it (Dt. 23:19)
7. is the price of blood. So after consultation
they bought with it the field of the potter
8. as a burial place for strangers. For this
reason that field received the name Field of
9. Blood unto this day. Then the word spoken
by the prophet Jeremiah was fulfilled: And (Zech. 11:12 f.
I took the thirty pieces of silver, the price LXX; *cf.* Jer. 32:
of him who had been valued (whom they 6–15; 18:2 f.)

27:10. had priced [4]) by the children of Israel; and
I gave them for the potter's field, as Jeho-
vah had bidden me.
11. Meanwhile Jesus stood before the governor; M
and the governor put to him the question, Mk 15:2–5
Art thou the king of the Jews? And Jesus
12. answered, That is for thee to say. But when
he was accused by the chief priests and
13. elders he answered nothing. Then Pilate
says to him, Hearest thou not what great
14. accusations they make against thee? But (Is. 53:7)
Jesus gave him not a single word of an-
swer, so that the governor marvelled
greatly.
15. Now it was the governor's custom at the fes- M
tival to release to them some one prisoner Mk 15:6–15
16. chosen by the crowd. They had at that
time a notorious prisoner called Bar-Abbas.
17. So when they were assembled Pilate said to
them, Whom do you want me to release to
18. you, Bar-Abbas, or Jesus called Christ. For
he knew that (Jesus) had been delivered
19. up out of jealousy.————While he was P(N)
seated on the tribunal his wife sent word
to him: Have nothing to do with that in-
nocent man, for I have suffered greatly
today in a dream about him.————
20. But the chief priests and elders persuaded
the crowds to ask for Bar-Abbas and to
21. have Jesus killed. So when the governor
asked them, Which of the two do you want
me to release to you? they said, Bar-Abbas.
22. Pilate says to them, What then shall I do
with Jesus, the so-called Christ? They all
say, Let him be crucified. Why, said he,
23. what wrong has he done? But they cried
out more fiercely than before, Let him be
24. crucified!————So when Pilate saw P(R?)
that it was no use, but rather a riot was
developing he took water and washed his
hands in presence of the crowd, saying, I
am innocent of the blood of this man; it is
25. your affair. To this all the people replied
saying, His blood be on us and on our
26. children!————Then he released to
them Bar-Abbas, but Jesus he scourged
and handed over to be crucified.

[4] Possibly a gloss in the LXX. See Appended Note V.

vi. The Crucifixion.

27:27. Then the governor's troops took Jesus into M
the barracks and collected the whole bat- Mk 15:16–20
28. talion. And when they had stripped him
they threw a scarlet mantle round him,
29. plaited a wreath of thorn and set it on his
head, put a reed in his right hand and knelt
before him in mockery saying, Hail, king
30. of the Jews! And spitting on him they took
31. the reed and struck him on the head. And
after they had mocked him they took off
the mantle and clothed him with his own
garments and led him off to be crucified.
32. And as they were going forth they met a man M
of Cyrene named Simon, whom they im- Mk 15:21–32
33. pressed to carry his cross. Coming to a
place called Golgotha, which may be trans-
34. lated Place of a Skull, they offered him a
drink of wine mixed with ***gall,*** but when he (Ps. 69:22)
35. had tasted it he refused to drink it. So
when they had crucified him they distrib- (Ps. 22:19)
uted his garments among them by drawing
36. lots, and sat down there to keep guard over
37. him. They also put up over his head the
charge against him in writing: THIS IS
38. JESUS, THE KING OF THE JEWS. At
the same time they also crucified with him
two robbers, one on the right hand and
39. one on the left. And those who passed by
40. reviled him, wagging their heads and say-
ing: Thou fellow that destroyest the temple
and rebuildest it in three days, save thyself,
if thou art the Son of God, and come down
41. from the cross! So too the chief priests with
the scribes and the elders scoffed at him
42. saying, He saved others, but cannot save
himself. He is king of Israel, let him come
down now from the cross and we will believe
43. in him.————He trusted in God, let R
Him now deliver him if He wants him. For (Ps. 22:9; Sap. 2:13)
he said, I am the Son of God.————
44. The robbers also who were crucified with
him insulted him in the same way.
45. Now from midday until three o'clock dark- M
46. ness covered the whole land, and about Mk 15:33–37
three o'clock Jesus gave a loud cry: Eli, Eli,
lema sabachthani, that is, My God, my God, (Ps. 22:2)
why hast thou forsaken me? Some of those

27:47. who were stationed there when they heard
48. this said, The man is calling for Elijah. So
one of them ran off forthwith and taking a
sponge which he soaked in vinegar he put
49. it on a reed and offered him drink. But the
rest said, Let him alone; let us see if Elijah
50. does come to save him. But Jesus gave
another loud cry and yielded up his spirit.
51. And lo, the curtain of the temple was torn in M
52. two from top to bottom,————the Mk 15:38 f.
rocks were split and the tombs opened and P(O?)
many bodies of the saints who slept in
53. death were raised up. After his resurrec-
tion they came forth from the tombs and
entering the holy city they appeared to
54. many.————But the centurion ***and his men*** who were watching Jesus, when ***they*** saw ***the earthquake and all that happened, were greatly terrified and*** said, Truly this man was a son of God.

vii. Burial, Resurrection, and Apostolic Mission.

55. Now there were a number of women there, look- M
ing on from a distance, women who had Mk 15:40–47
followed Jesus from Galilee ministering to
56. him. Among these were Mary of Magdala,
Mary the mother of James and Joseph, and
57. the mother of the sons of Zebedee. And
when evening came, a rich man from Ari-
mathea whose name was Joseph, himself ***a***
58. ***disciple of Jesus***, approached Pilate and
asked for the body of Jesus. Then Pilate
ordered that the body be delivered to him.
59. So he took down the body of Jesus, wrapped
60. it in a clean sheet, and put it in his own new
tomb which he had cut in the rock. And
when he had rolled a great stone against
the entrance of the tomb he went away.
61. And Mary of Magdala and the other Mary
were there, sitting opposite the tomb.
62. On the next day, that is, on the day after the P(O?)
Preparation, the chief priests and the Phar-
63. isees came in a body to Pilate saying, Sir,
we recall that that impostor while alive
said, After three days I shall be raised up.
64. Give orders, therefore, for the tomb to be
kept secure till the third day, lest his dis-
ciples come and steal him away and then

tell the people, He is risen from the dead. The end of the fraud will then be worse
27:65. than the beginning. Pilate says to them, Take a guard of soldiers, go and make it
66. as safe as you know how. So they went away and made the tomb secure, setting a seal on the stone and establishing the guard.
28:1. At the close of the sabbath, when the day was M
dawning which begins the week, Mary Mk 16:1–8
of Magdala and the other Mary came to
2. look at the tomb. ***And lo, a great earth-*** R
quake had taken place. For an angel of the Lord had come down from heaven and had come up and rolled away the stone and
3. ***was sitting on it. His appearance was like lightning*** and his garments white as snow,
4. ***and from fear of him the sentries shook and***
5. ***became like dead men. This angel*** addressed the women saying, Have no fear; I know that you are looking for Jesus who
6. was crucified. He is not here, for he has been raised up as he said. Come, see the
7. place where he lay. And go quickly and tell his disciples that he has been raised from the dead; and lo, he is going before you into Galilee, there you will see him.
8. Lo, I have told you. So they ran quickly from the tomb with fear ***and great joy to***
9. ***bring word to his disciples.***————And P(N?)
lo, Jesus met them, saying, Hail! And they came up and caught hold of his feet and
10. did him obeisance. Then Jesus says to them: Have no fear! Go and tell my disciples to go into Galilee and they will see me there.
11. Now while they were on the way lo, some mem- P(O?)
bers of the guard went into the city and reported to the chief priests all that had
12. happened. So when they had met with the elders and taken counsel they gave the soldiers a considerable sum of money,
13. bidding them say, His disciples came by night and stole him away while we were
14. asleep. If this comes to the ears of the governor (they added), we will use persuasion with him and keep you out of trouble.
15. So they took the money and did as they were instructed; and this story is dissem-

inated among the Jews down to the present day.

28:16. So the eleven disciples journeyed to Galilee, P(R)
to the mountain where Jesus had arranged
17. to meet them. And when they saw him they
did him obeisance, though some were in
18. doubt. But Jesus came up to them and
said, Full authority has been given to me in
19. heaven and on earth. Go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them into
the name of the Father and of the Son and
20. of the Holy Spirit. Teach them to keep all
the commandments I have laid on you. Lo,
I will be with you all the time, to the very
end of the world.

PART IV

THE THEMES OF MT

THEME I

THE NEW ETHIC OF JESUS AND THE LAW

The first of Mt's five Discourses is framed to meet the needs of the neophyte, who must be instructed in what is designated by Paul "the law of Christ," by Jas. "the perfect law of liberty," and by Jn "the new commandment" that we "have from him, that he who loveth God love his brother also." It is clear that the so-called Sermon on the Mount of Mt 5–7 aims to give more specific application to the comprehensive principle expressed in these general terms by bringing Christian practice into comparison with the Law of Moses.

The Christian community for which the Discourse is framed is preponderantly Jewish in derivation and takes great offense at the "lawlessness" of many Gentile-christian churches among which the "scandal" which had elicited the rebukes of Paul had been repeated and aggravated by abuse of the Pauline principle "all things are lawful." The Pastoral Epistles, with Jas. and Jude, give us a glimpse into this demoralization.

Mt has framed his Gospel with these conditions in view. In his so-called Sermon on the Mount he has combined a series of sayings and discourses of Jesus in the framework of Mk's account of the beginning of Jesus' preaching throughout Galilee of repentance in view of the Coming (4:17–25 = Mk 1:14–39), aiming to show what this repentance in view of the Coming involves. The material, nearly all derived from S, consists of two or three extended Q discourses expanded by the insertion of some briefer logia interpretatively elaborated by R himself. The Sermon further receives from him special direction and application to current conditions by expansion near the beginning (5:13–20) and the close (7:13–23).

It belongs to the task of biblical theology of the Gospels to analyze this material by means of the Lukan parallels, determining so far as possible its original form, context and application, and thus to bring Jesus' own teaching on the topics concerned into comparison with the special application of them effected by R^{mt} to meet the needs and conditions of 90–95 A.D. What these were we have endeavored to determine in Part I. The particular motives effective in the composition of Mt's first Book (chh. 3–7) have been discussed in Part II. We may therefore now limit ourselves to a discussion of the actual teaching of Jesus on the topics selected by Mt, premising that the

selection and adaptation are the evangelist's, and may not be taken to represent the historic fact until every critical means has been employed to distinguish between the later adaptation and the original.

For the purposes of this distinction several sources are available. Besides the self-consistency which must be assumed between different utterances of the great Teacher himself, we have for nearly all the elements of the Sermon the independent report of Lk, and for much of the teaching, including the very important factor of occasion and situation, the earlier and more authentic narrative of Mk. The great Q discourses on (1) Filial Righteousness (5:3 f., 6, 10–12, 43–48; 7:1–5, 18, 24–27), (2) Abiding Wealth (6:19–21, 25–33), and (3) Prayer (6:9–13; 7:7–11) are paralleled (1) in Lk 6:20–49, (2) in Lk 12:22–34, and (3) in Lk 11:1–4, 9–13. With these resources available the task of the biblical theologian is far from hopeless. The essential teaching of Jesus on at least the three major topics may be distinguished with considerable confidence from the special application which has been given it by Mt. Our plan will naturally be to determine first from the Q parallels and such additional evidence as is elsewhere available the basic principles of Jesus on the principal topic concerned, thereafter accounting for Mt's supplementary material and adaptation in accordance with the known propensities and methods of this evangelist.

i

Mt naturally chooses as the nucleus for his first great Discourse the extended utterance which in Lk 6:20–49 appears as an address to Jesus' adherents congratulating them as heirs of the coming kingdom, and presenting its principles in contrast to those of the ungodly world as those which if consistently applied produce sure fruits, giving a rock foundation to human life. The occasion is determined for both Mt and Lk by Mk's account of the withdrawal of Jesus and his following from the synagogues in consequence of Pharisaic hostility, and the general nature of the discourse, which formulates a new standard for the conduct of life, corroborates this placing. Jesus could hardly advance to the point of proposing a new ethic while still on terms of friendly co-operation with the leaders of the Synagogue. Therefore the address cannot be placed early in the ministry. His disciples are already a separate body. On the other hand he would be naturally impelled to define his principles, if he intended to hold together his following as a true brotherhood of "sons and daughters of the Highest," very shortly after the breach with the Synagogue occurred. We may therefore accept the occasion on which Mt and Lk agree as substantially correct.

The great difference between the two reports of the discourse

appears in the epitome just made of Lk 6:20–49. Lk presents the principles of the kingdom-seekers "in contrast to those of the ungodly world." Mt presents them in contrast with "the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees" (5:20).[1] In view of what we can clearly determine of the special situation, propensities, and method of R^{mt} this particular application of the discourse by R^{mt} may be largely discounted, even while we make allowance also for the catholicizing tendencies of the Gentile evangelist Lk. Something, however, will remain of the anti-Pharisaism so characteristic of Mt.

The radical belligerency of Mk against Jewish legalism *in toto* (*cf.* Mk 2:1–3:6; 7:1–23; 10:1–52) is incompatible with the references of Paul to Jesus' conciliatory attitude (Rom. 14:18–22; 15:8; I Cor. 11:1; Gal. 4:4 f.); nevertheless the breach with the Synagogue leaders unquestionably did take place. Jesus may not be responsible for the exact language of the stanza added by Mt from Ecclus. 51 to the Hymn of the Calling of the Sons of God in Mt 11:29 f., but he surely did offer to his followers another "yoke" than that of the scribes. He surely did give a "new commandment" as even Paul bears witness (Rom. 13:8–10), and the foundation of this new ethic was the doctrine of divine Fatherhood with its corollary of human brotherhood. In Mk 12:28–31 this summary of the Law is laid down no less clearly than in Paul and Jn. It is an inference, and a logical one, from the doctrine of sonship, Jesus' ideal of the Kingdom. Therefore the teaching of the discourse on Filial Righteousness stands on the strongest possible foundation. Jesus surely did offer a new ethic to his followers, contrasting it with that which others (including their former teachers of the Synagogue) might offer. He congratulated them on the Kingdom in store for them as "sons and daughters of the Highest." He made this principle basic for the entire conduct of life. It was to be a rock foundation; any other would be mere sand.

We have, therefore, essential agreement between the two extant reports as to the outline and substance of the discourse on Filial Righteousness, just as we have found agreement as to its general place, date, and occasion. It was addressed to Jesus' following in Galilee, a following largely composed of the "people of the soil" (*ʾam-ha-aretz*) and the "unchurched" (ἀποσυναγώγοι), resistant to Pharisean orthodoxy. It took place after a crisis in Jesus' relations with the Synagogue which compelled him to withdraw with this motley following to the open country at the lake-shore.

[1] *Cf.* Stanton, *GHD*, II, p. 104. The Come-outers of Mt revolt against the Synagogue, those of Lk against the mammon-worshipping world. Hence the Lukan Beatitudes oppose external conditions of hardship, whereas, in Mt the traits extolled are moral and spiritual as against unreal, *e.g.*, inward (vs. ceremonial) purity.

The discourse began with beatitudes upon the proletarian crowd which had welcomed his "gospel of the kingdom," many of whom, no doubt, had already been "baptized with the baptism of John." This crowd had welcomed Jesus as a worthy successor to the "prophet." It was a crowd thoroughly representative of the Galilean "people of the soil" (*ȧm-ha-aretz*), peasants, fishermen, artisans of Jesus' own class, the masses of this rural and small-town district. For as yet Galilee was very imperfectly subjugated by the book-religion of the Pharisees and scribes from Jerusalem. Its people were still restive under the exacting yoke of the Synagogue, but were now deeply stirred by the "prophet" voices of John and of Jesus. "Galilee of the Gentiles," or, as we should say, "half-heathen" Galilee, a district forcibly converted to Judaism of the Ezra type less than 200 years before, had flocked out after the "prophet" of Nazareth, who now had been placed under the unofficial ban of the Synagogue authorities. Jesus meets them with a solemn and repeated assurance that the kingdom of God is meant for them—not for the rich, the prosperous, the self-satisfied, high in the esteem of the world. "Rejoice, ye poor, ye sinners, ye despised, for the coming kingdom is meant for you."

After this exordium followed a new Torah, an ethic of Filial Righteousness having relation to Synagogue standards analogous to that of Amos or Micah to the priestly. The authority of the representatives of book religion, the scribe and his "blind" follower the Pharisee, had at last come into collision with a new authority revived from the glorious and cherished past, the authority of the prophet.

The rule of "book religion" had been "until John"; since then the kingdom of God had been preached and "men of violence" (as these Come-outers were called by the orthodox who stood aloof from the repentance of John) were taking it for their own, refusing to be excluded by those who claimed to hold its keys. The clash of authority reached its climax in unconcealed murmurs of the scribes against Jesus' unqualified assurances of forgiveness, and Pharisaic objections to his free mode of life, his neglect of the ordinances and his association with the class excluded from the Synagogue. Some even averred that there were plots between the Pharisees and the tyrant who had imprisoned John to take the life of John's successor. At all events the breach had now come between Jesus and the Synagogue. What would he put in place of the book religion of organized Mosaism? What had the new prophet to offer as against the scriptures of "the Law and the prophets"?

It is this irrepressible conflict which comes to the surface in the main body of the discourse whose subject we define as Filial Righteousness. Over against it Mt sets in contrast "the righteousness of

the scribes and Pharisees." This background, or foil, exaggerated by our anti-Pharisaic evangelist, has almost disappeared from Lk, whose Gentile readers were more concerned with the contrast between the Church and the world than between Church and Synagogue. Yet even without the foil the sense and application of the great teaching is unmistakable, and unmistakably characteristic. Jesus speaks with the authority of the prophet for the prophet's ideal: "What doth Jehovah require of thee but to do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God?" Walking humbly with God Jesus interprets to mean putting absolute trust in the Father in heaven and showing the justice and mercy that He shows. It is the simple, genuine religion of the Galilean "man of the soil," who looks up with trust to the Giver of rain and fruitful seasons, and shows kindness to his neighbor whether reckoned among the registered "sons and daughters of Abraham" or not. Alas, untaught, "half-heathen" Galilee! But like other great reform movements in religion, that of John and Jesus struck backward and downward to the great tap-root of the innate moral and religious instinct of man. John spoke for the everlasting God of Righteousness, Jesus for the Father in heaven.

The closing section of the discourse is an application of its permeating principle. Once more, while we must certainly discount both special interests of Mt, his abhorrence of "the hypocrites" of the Synagogue on the one side and of the "false prophets" who teach "lawlessness" on the other, we shall do well to remember, despite the non-appearance of this element in Lk, that the foil of book religion is to be seen in the background of the application but little less clearly than in the earlier parts of the discourse. The principle of Filial Righteousness is to be applied not in censorious judgment of others but in self-development (Mt 7:1–5 = Lk 6:37 f., 41 f.). Moreover this self-development is not an external business of accumulating "good works" which may merit reward, but an inward renovation which makes them flow from the heart as naturally as vine and fig tree bear their fruit (Mt 7:16 f., 21 = Lk 6:43–46). With an inward disposition thus conformed to that of the great Giver of Good the follower of the new prophecy will have an ethic not liable to lead astray.

The conclusion of the discourse is a parable, framed like the Beatitudes for the encouragement of the "little flock." To shape one's life on the principle of the filial attitude toward God, the brotherly toward man, is to build on the rock. To disregard or flout this principle is to build on the sand (Mt 7:24–27 = Lk 6:47–49).[2]

[2] With this practical application of the ethic of sons it is instructive to compare the emphasis laid by Epictetus on his ethic as an applied rule of life.

There exist but two possible tests for the historicity of this discourse: its agreement or disagreement with the historical situation as described by Mk; and its agreement or disagreement with the religious teaching of Jesus on other occasions as most fully reported in the Second Source. Both these tests result in a verdict of confirmation which can scarcely fall short of unanimity among those best qualified to judge.

Mk does not report the discourse but tells the circumstances. Jesus had taken up the message of the imprisoned prophet and preached "the gospel of God" in the synagogues throughout Galilee, saying, "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe in the glad tidings" (Mk 1:15). The "authority" and freedom of this revival of prophecy had aroused the opposition of the Synagogue leaders until Jesus and his following had been obliged to withdraw almost in a body, though not, as yet, an organized body. The Gospels differ as to whether any besides earlier disciples of John had been baptized. If so, the baptism was simply "John's baptism" with water unto repentance. It merely set apart those who received it as "a people prepared for the Coming" by repentance, an "inner circle" with reference to the indifferent masses, but quite markedly an outer circle with reference to the Synagogue, whose standard of "preparedness" was different. Mk shows us, not indeed with the definiteness of the historian supplied with firsthand testimony, but with quite sufficient clearness, that such was the relation of Speaker and following, on the one hand to the Synagogue, on the other to the movement of John.

As to the contents of the discourse Mk thinks he has told enough in describing the teaching of Jesus in general terms as "the gospel of God," adding only that Jesus proclaimed: "The kingdom of God is at hand, repent and put your trust in Him." We must turn to Q for further light on the contents of this earliest message.

In view of the fact that "the beginning of the gospel" was confessedly a renewal of the prophetic message of the Baptist, carried into Galilee by the imprisoned prophet's successor, it is most important to know what John meant by his message and the rite accompanying it, a rite to which Jesus himself had submitted.

The rite evidently did set apart "a people prepared for the Coming." Along with the Pharisees "the disciples of John" were already at this time a recognized factor among the religious-minded of Galilee (Mk 2:18). Both groups were forward-looking. Both called for moral reformation in view of the Day of Jehovah. But it is clear from the Q report of the preaching of John, with or without the expansion of Lk 3:10–14 describing the nature of that "repentance" to which he summoned specifically "tax-collectors" and "soldiers" as well as the

people in general, that John's preaching was not rooted in the teaching of the scribes. John was "a prophet." His message was as little confined by the particularism of the Synagogue as that of an Amos or a Malachi. There is almost a tone of contempt for the preparedness of Pharisaism in the words: "Think not to say to yourselves, We are sons of Abraham. I tell you God is able to raise up sons of Abraham out of these stones. Bring forth fruits such as repentance requires, for even now the axe lies at the root of the tree. God's threshing-floor is soon to be visited and His wheat will be garnered. But there is chaff also. The chaff will be burnt up with unquenchable fire."

Both John's prophetic message and his prophetic "authority" had reappeared in the preaching of Jesus. Also the disdain of particularism and book righteousness. Jesus' Father in heaven, like the God of the prophets, was the God of all outdoors. Had the discourse on Filial Righteousness lacked this bigness and simplicity of the discourse of John we must have questioned its derivation from the Nazarene on whom the mantle of John had fallen.

But we must also have questioned its authenticity if it had failed to show the new feature which Jesus himself brings out, a feature characteristic of his own message in distinction from that of John. The message of John was a warning of judgment to come, harsh and austere like the wailing of funeral pipes or the denunciation of Jonah's woes upon guilty Nineveh. By comparison Jesus' message of glad tidings to the meek, release from the bondage of the Strong man armed, forgiveness to the penitent, was like the song of wedding festivities, a voice of the tender and pleading "Wisdom of God" seeking to save men from their follies. It was a "gospel." Had Jesus not begun by confirming these glad tidings to the poor who had flocked around him from the Galilean countryside—had his welcome not been voiced in something like these sublime Beatitudes, we must have thought the discourse itself lacked something of Jesus' characteristic note. As Jas. reminds his readers, the essence of this "gospel" had been: "God chose them that are poor as to the world to be rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which He promised to them that love Him." The "perfect law of liberty" was uttered to such "little ones" as these.

All parts of the discourse alike, exordium, theme and application, are visibly dominated by the characteristic feature of Jesus' religious thought, his unswerving faith in the all-wise, all-loving, all-controlling Father in heaven. It is the same triumphant faith in God illustrated in the symbol-story of the Temptations that appears also in the Beatitudes, in the New Ethic of Sons, and in its Application, the parable of the house built on the rock. Both witnesses, the Q stories of John and Jesus from the beginning of the Teaching Source, and the

story of the Great Commandment from the end of the public ministry as narrated by Mk, combine to confirm the claim of the discourse on Filial Righteousness to reflect the very heart of the religion of Jesus.

ii

In the introductory analysis of the discourse of Mt's first Book we found occasion to observe that besides introducing into the main body of the discourse the substance of two other extended discourses from S, one on Abiding Wealth, the other on Prayer, Mt has expanded the Beatitudes to double their original number, giving all but the last the form of commandments, by obedience to which admission may be won to the joys of the kingdom. He makes them anti-Pharisaic admonitions: "Blessed are the poor *in spirit* for theirs is the kingdom," "Blessed are the meek" (*cf.* 23:1–12), "Blessed are the inwardly pure" (*cf.* 15:1–14). He has also prefixed to the section on Imitation of the Divine Goodness an exordium (5:13–16) compounded by himself from a number of brief logia urging the necessity of "good works," together with an apologia defining Jesus' attitude toward "the Law and the prophets" as wholly constructive (verses 17–20). It was also made probable that the same compiler has used at least one other discourse from S (omitted by Lk) to expand the discourse on Filial Righteousness, this discourse (Filial Worship, 6:1–18) being itself expanded by an extract (verses 9–13) from the Q discourse on Prayer.[3] For Mt's purpose it was essential to supply full directions to the catechumen, so far as reports of Jesus' teaching allowed, of how Christian worship and religious observance should surpass that of "the hypocrites." Both in form and substance this summary of religious observance truly acceptable to "the Father that seeth in secret," in contrast with the externalities of Pharisaism, gives every indication of authenticity, and in spite of its non-appearance in Lk might well be derived from S. For while its present position, separating 5:43–48 from its proper sequel in 7:1 ff., cannot well be original, the very fact that R^{mt} has contrived to fit into it by means of verses 7 f. and 14 f. a part of the Q discourse on Prayer goes to show that the remainder (6:1–4, 5–8, 16–18) was a unit in the source. Lk might well omit material so exclusively Jewish-christian in interest, while we, for similar reasons, may also temporarily disregard the discourse on Prayer in our investigation of Jesus' relation to the Law.

Whatever its source the authenticity of the discourse on Spiritual Worship is impregnable. As before the characteristic note is inwardness. Jesus brings to bear his own sense of a filial relation to the heavenly Father, contrasting this with the empty observances which

[3] See Appended Note VIII.

the gaping multitude considers to be adding to the Pharisee's store of merit and "reward in heaven."

The question may be left open whether with Hawkins to regard the Antitheses of the Higher Righteousness prefixed to the exhortation to imitate the Divine Goodness in 5:21–37 (this section itself expanded by several supplements) as originally part of the S discourse on Filial Righteousness. Lk might have omitted it as offering too ready a handle to opponents of the Old Testament. We might, on the other hand, with McNeile, consider the substance of it (apart from such Q supplements as verses 25 f. = Lk 12:57–59 and the redaction) as drawn from some unknown written source of similar character to S. As before in the case of 6:1–18 the material will be recognized either way as authentic. Moreover the sayings correctly reflect Jesus' attitude toward the written Law. They must therefore be taken into consideration as testimony of value in spite of the silence of Lk.

Indeed, for determination of the question of Jesus' relation to the Mosaic Law the discourse on Filial Righteousness offers far more to the enquirer than Mt's supplements from the Q discourses on Abiding Wealth (6:19–34—expanded by insertion of Q material in verses 22–24 = Lk 11:34–36 and 16:13) and on Prayer (6:9–13 = Lk 11:2–4 and 7:7–11 = Lk 11:9–13). The former of these is interjected by Mt after the phrase "The Father that seeth in secret will *reward* thee," as giving further assurance of heavenly *reward*. The latter, standing immediately before the editorial summary of "the Law and the prophets" (7:12 = Lk 6:31) has apparently a similar function in Mt's intention. "Your heavenly Father will *give good things* to them that ask Him" serves as a promise of reward to the obedient. It is habitual with Mt to introduce, whether from his written sources or from any other, such sanctions of the commandment. These well-attested discourses of Jesus have the highest value, but as they are not directly concerned in their original connection with the subject of his New Ethic we may follow Lk in reserving them for treatment in their proper context.

There remains as the authentic nucleus about which Mt has built up his great discourse on the New Torah of Jesus the Q material which in Lk 6:20–49 appears as an address to the disciples and the Galilean multitude after Jesus' withdrawal from the Synagogue, and the discourse on Inward Worship. The address first congratulates his followers as the true heirs of the coming kingdom, thereafter lays down the principle of imitation of the Father's goodness as the true basis of moral conduct, and lastly applies this to individual life. For the discourse on Inward Worship we must refer to Appended Note VIII. It is doubtful whether we should add it to that on Filial Right-

eousness on the basis of Mt's testimony alone, but the latter at least presents a characteristic contrast between the precepts of book religion as taught by the scribes, and the divine standard of God's goodness as actually experienced. The discourse on Inward Worship may belong to a different context; but for the ethic of Jesus we must compare all reliable testimony in order properly to distinguish between the actual position taken by him with reference to the Law, and the special development of this teaching set forth by Mt in his endeavor to direct the Church aright between the Scylla of Pharisaism and the Charybdis of Hellenistic libertinism.

iii

A leading English scholar has recently observed:

> The question of Christ's relation to the Jewish Law is one of fundamental importance for the origin of Christianity, but at the same time of peculiar difficulty.

Among the difficulties which he enumerates not the least is this:

> When we consider how bitter was the strife which this question aroused in the primitive Church the misgiving is not unreasonable that this may have been reflected back into the life of the Founder, and sayings placed in his mouth endorsing one of the later, partisan views.

Comparative study of the Gospels has in fact established certain differences of representation on this point corresponding to those apparent between the other New Testament writings. We have already defined the distinctive standpoint of Mt, and must now endeavor to bring it into just comparison with the witness of other sources.

Mk has three sections which bear upon the question of Jesus and the Law: (1) the series of anecdotes in 2:1–3:6 relating the growth of opposition to Jesus' work of preaching and healing in Galilee on the part of the scribes and Pharisees, a series which culminates in Jesus' withdrawal with his following from the Synagogue; (2) the section appended to the Galilean ministry in 6:56–8:26 relating Jesus' work among Gentiles and in Perea, whose opening paragraph (7:1–23) describes his controversy with certain scribes who had come down from Jerusalem over the Mosaic distinctions of "clean" and "unclean"; (3) the group of anecdotes in 10:1–45 on the issue of Law versus Grace. We may take these up in order, seeking an unprejudiced appreciation of Mk's distinctive point of view.

1. In the group Mk 2:1–3:6 the reader is told how the scribes and Pharisees objected successively to Jesus' proclamation of forgiveness, his association with tax-collectors and sinners, his disregard

of the set fasts, and the laxity shown both by himself and his followers in the matter of sabbath observance. In this series of anecdotes Mk does not attempt to define the constructive teaching of Jesus [4] but treats the issue as a question of bald authority. Because Jesus is the Son of Man, and can prove by miracle the divine source of his mission, the scribes have no right to object. The Son of Man has authority, even while still on earth, to forgive sins, disregard the prescribed ordinances, and even, on occasion, to set aside the sabbath. This defiant attitude of Jesus toward the Law leads the Pharisees to conspire with the Herodians against his life.

2. The second of Mk's sections on Jesus and the Law comes nearer to a discussion of the matter on principle, though it is limited to that phase which brought about the great conflict of apostolic times, the Mosaic distinctions of "clean" and "unclean," with special application to the problem of preaching among Gentiles. As our discussion introductory to Mt's fourth Book has already involved some discussion of this historic issue of the apostolic Church, and further discussion will be involved in our treatment of the theme of this fourth Book below, under the title The Unity of the Church, we may properly limit present consideration to an enquiry into the principle appealed to by Mk. What was the ground taken by Jesus in justification of his disregard for the Mosaic ceremonial distinctions?

3. The third Markan group bearing upon the question of Jesus and the Law comes nearest to a treatment of the real issue after the fundamental manner of Paul, contrasting Law and Grace as alternative grounds for the hope of salvation. The series of anecdotes and sayings in Mk 10:1–45 presents the contrast of the Pharisean ideal of merit winning eternal life as its heavenly reward, with the Christian ideal of childlike dependence on the goodness of a Father in heaven, accompanied by self-dedication without reserve. The series is prefaced by one of those logia which Burkitt speaks of as "doubly attested," having the support not only of Q but of Mk also. Whether with or without dependence on S, Mk's account of the question put by the Pharisees as to the Mosaic law of divorce (Mk 10:1–12) prefaces the group of illustrations of Christian teachings on Merit and Reward in the remainder of the section with the most far-reaching of the utterances of Jesus in rejection of scribal authority. The brief and guarded reference to the same saying in Lk 16:16–18 shows clearly by a double reference to the authority of "the Law and the prophets" first as superseded (verse 16) then as unalterable (verse 17) that Lk is at least aware of the revolutionary possibilities involved in Jesus' recognition of a human element in the Torah, which must be distinguished from the divine. It should be observed that

[4] The true text of Mk 2:26 ff. does not include verse 27.

Mt also, in his Q transcript of the logion (5:31 f.), ranges it under the series of Antitheses of the Higher Law which contrast even the moral commandments of Moses' law with the inward righteousness required of the follower of Jesus.

In all three of these Markan groups Jesus is shown in revolt against the institutions of Mosaism. In the first he claims authority to disregard fasts and sabbaths, in the second he "makes all meats clean," in the third he declares marital relations explicitly permitted by the Torah to be "adultery." It hardly needs the contemptuous tone in which the Roman evangelist dismisses the "washings of cups and pots and brazen vessels" practiced (so he declares) by "the Pharisees and *all the Jews*" to convince us that his sympathies are thoroughly Gentile. On the other hand the skill and ingenuity with which Mt, our "scribe made a disciple to the kingdom of heaven," has adjusted this Markan radicalism to an attitude of entire loyalty to the eternal and divine commandment of Moses, however free from scribal authority in matters of interpretation, is no less remarkable than his extreme reluctance to depart from Mk's general outline of the ministry to the extent practiced by Lk. Except for the teachings supplied from S the Petrine anecdotes of Mk, though not their Markan order, seem to hold for Mt a place of unique authority.

The first group of Markan stories of conflict between Jesus and the synagogue authorities over fasts and Sabbaths is not retained by Mt as a group. As respects the appointed fasts Mt's view does not differ appreciably from Mk's. To both evangelists these observances practiced by the Pharisees and the disciples of John belong to an obsolete past, they are mere patches on an old garment whose rent is only made worse by the unprescribed addition.

If we may attempt to define the ground actually taken by Jesus in distinction from the report of both evangelists, it was certainly not the mere difference of times and seasons assumed to be basic in Mk 2:19 f. = Mt 9:15 and *Didaché* viii, 1. It is more likely to have rested on the prophetic principle expressed in Is. 58:3–7 and that of inward worship set forth in Mt 6:16–18.

As respects sabbath observance Mt endorses Mk's claim of "authority over the sabbath" for the Son of Man, but removes the two instances of alleged sabbath breaking to another context (12:1–14 = Mk 2:23–3:6), and attaches supplements to both (verses 5–7 and 11 f.) whose purpose is to show that Jesus' action was fully justified by precedent as an entirely proper application of the law. Mt is a well-informed scribe, Mk is not.

Mk's second group, as we have seen, restricts consideration to the laws of "clean and unclean," using the S^q logion contrasting outward with inward purity to support the radical assertion that Jesus "made

all meats clean." In reality Mk's radical comment is no more than his own sweeping version of Q (Mt 23:26 = Lk 11:41). But it is no surprise to find this Markan comment on the saying lacking in Mt's transcription. It might to some be a surprise, however, to find Mt apparently endorsing the distinction between divine requirement and human, expressed in Mk's quotation from Is. 29:13 "In vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrines precepts of men." Mt holds in fact that the logion does not discriminate between the "weightier matters of the Law" relating to moral conduct and the ceremonial distinctions and observances so frequently subordinated by the prophets, but only between the Torah itself and the oral law, or "tradition of the elders," the latter alone being "man-made."

It is difficult to see what object can be subserved by Mt's transposition of verses 9–13 of the Markan story, and especially by his addition of the reference to the "hedge of the Law" as a "planting which my heavenly Father hath not planted" in verses 12–14, unless he intends to draw the line between the Torah itself as inculcating only purity of heart, and the food laws as of human devising. But as we have seen this is precisely the "Petrine" standpoint of Acts 10:1–11:18, as against the Jacobean of Acts 15–28.

Mt's real difficulty lies with a further utterance addressed to the people appended by Mk after the colloquy with the scribes over the "tradition of the elders" about ablutions is ended. This is Mk's *interpretation* (verses 17–23), of Jesus' repudiation of the tradition (the ablutions were a practice introduced since the time of Hillel and Shammai) and his application of the Q logion to the food laws of Lev. 11 and the kindred prescriptions as to "clean" and "unclean" of Lev. 13–15. As McNeile very clearly states the case:

> Jesus could rebuke the scribes for annulling the Mosaic law, and yet, on this fundamental point, annulled it himself. He felt free to commit himself to this formal inconsistency, because the kernel of his teaching was that the spirit transcends the letter.

As to the kernel of Jesus' teaching there will be no difference of opinion, but as regards the formal inconsistency we may well question the authenticity of that application of the logion to the Mosaic dietary laws which Mk makes in 7:14–23, and which Mt has taken over with careful modifications. This question must be considered shortly in view of the testimony of Paul and Lk. In the meantime we must continue our comparison of Mk and Mt. Each of these evangelists undoubtedly reflects the belief and practice of his own contemporary circle.

It is true that Prophets and Psalmists alike abound with assurances that the only real requirement of God is of *moral* purity, and that

large elements of Judaism (at least in the *diaspora*) treated the Levitical requirements as to food taboos either as obsolete (so in Adiabene when Izates took his earlier view) or as subject to such allegorizing interpretation as they receive in Ps-Aristeas and Ps-Barnabas (so in Egypt). It is also true that the story of Peter's vision at Joppa, which in Acts 10:1–11:18 paves the way for a decision of the Church endorsing Gentile missions conducted without regard for distinctions of "clean" and "unclean," also takes the ground that these are "man-made." God makes all food "clean," it is a purely human device to reject certain foods, or men, as "common" or "unclean." And yet it is insupposable that either the Petrine source of Acts 10:1–11:18 or our Mt can have intended to justify those heretical Jewish sects of the *Clementina* who anticipated modern criticism in applying the knife to the Books of Moses, maintaining that certain portions were unauthentic. If Mt intends the designation "precepts of men" to apply only to the unwritten law, he may, like Ps-Barnabas, have considered the interpretation of the Levitical food-laws as obligatory in their literal sense on all Jews to be contrary to the divine intention, an unwarranted imposition of the scribes supported by their blind followers the Pharisees. He may on the other hand have regarded them as frankly obsolete.

Two considerations make the former explanation improbable: (1) Mt gives no indication elsewhere of the Alexandrian method of allegorizing exegesis; (2) other Matthean passages such as 5:17–19, and especially the remainder of the section which transcribes Mk's on Jesus among Gentiles, wherein Peter is solemnly endowed with authority to "bind and loose" (16:19), indicate that Mt concurs with Acts 10:1–11:18 in ascribing the solution of this crucial problem of the apostolic Church to the bold action of Peter, who, *previous to his weakening before the delegates from James at Antioch*, had treated the dietary laws as "precepts of men," and had obtained the approbation of at least an important element of the Church for his action.

The principal changes in Mt's transcription of Mk 7:14–23 are: (1) the insertion of verses 12–14 condemning the "hedge of the Law" at a point which we must admit suggests the intention to include the dietary laws as no more than part of the "tradition of the elders"; (2) the substitution of "Peter" for "the disciples" as author of the request for explanation (verse 15=Mk 7:17); (3) the addition to the closing summary (verse 20=Mk 7:23) of the negative clause "but eating with unwashed hands does not defile the man." This return to the original point at issue indicates that to Mt's understanding of the matter Jesus had never really left it. Mt holds that it is the ablutions alone which are here primarily concerned and cancels Mk's comment on the saying about inward and outward cleansing because he does not

agree to it. In other words he understands the saying not to abolish but to *subordinate* the outward. Peter, in due time, will receive authority to "loose" this "least commandment of the Law."

We have still to consider Mt's treatment of the Pharisees' enquiry as to the law of divorce, a narrative which introduces Mk's third and most important group on Jesus and the Law. Mk elaborates the story with great freedom in the interest of his own application. However, the emphasis unquestionably falls in every form upon the distinction between human and divine authority, "What, therefore, *God* hath joined together let not *man* put asunder."

In this case there was no escape for Mt by resort to the merely human authority of the "tradition of the elders." Nor does he seek it. He accepts the distinction between a divine and a human element in the Law. Indeed he had both accepted and emphasized it in the Antitheses of the first Discourse. To quote the Decalogue *seriatim* accompanying each citation with a more searching requirement under the rubric "But I say" was to admit that mere "law-righteousness" was not enough. On the other hand this admission need not in the least imply imperfection in the Law, but only (and this is clearly the true meaning of the logion) that not all parts of it have the same object in view. What to Jesus are "the weightier matters of the Law" are addressed to the individual Israelite that he may become "perfect as the Father in heaven is perfect." Other portions give directions for the priests in the conduct of the temple service, still others are for the use of magistrates in the repression of crime and administration of justice.

In the regulation of the family "Moses" gives *two* utterances. The ideal is expressed in the Creation story. Remedy for one of the great evils denounced by Malachi, repudiation of "the wife of thy youth," is applied in the Deuteronomic requirement of a certificate of divorce before exercising the despotic rights of the oriental husband. Mt not only entirely approves of the humane restriction imposed by Dt. 24:1 as a curb on "hardness of heart," but (contrary to the testimony of Paul and all other witnesses) imposes still further restrictions in the name of Jesus himself. According to Mt 5:32 and 19:9 Jesus in this instance stepped out from the domain of the prophet, whose demand is simply and broadly "judgment, mercy and good faith," to enter that of the scribe or lawyer, placing himself this time in the stricter school of Shammai against the more liberal interpretation of Hillel. We have abundant reason for denying that Jesus ever thus consented to arrogate to himself functions which on other occasions he declares to belong to a different jurisdiction (*cf.* Lk 12:14). But we can only endorse Mt's understanding of Jesus' saying about the Law as against the application given it by Mk, both here and previously in 7:14–23.

Whatever imperfection later generations may find in the Law of Moses, historically it is most improbable that Jesus should have used toward it, or any part of it, expressions of less esteem than Paul, who in the very act of declaring it done away by the cross pronounces it "holy and righteous and good."

If, then, judgment be called for as between Mt and Mk in their respective representations of Jesus and the Law the balance, in spite of all defects, must incline strongly in favor of Mt. Jesus' attitude toward the Law is consistently and uniformly that of the prophet, applying and teaching its "weightier" commandments. He subordinates, but *does not annul*, its ritual and ceremonial requirements. As regards fasts he teaches that they shall be employed as expressions of real sorrow and contrition as between the individual soul and the Father that seeth in secret. For set fasts that belie the real disposition of the soul he has only the contemptuous epithet "hypocrisy." As regards sabbaths again Jesus stands with the prophets. The rabbinic saying "The sabbath was made for man, not man for the sabbath," which so well sums up the humanitarian view expressed in Dt. 5:14 f. and Is. 58:13, is probably not his authentic utterance, however in harmony with his mind. But Mt is surely right in placing Jesus side by side with not a few contemporary rabbis in their humanitarian interpretation of the sabbath, rather than Mk, who makes him override it by superior authority attested by miracle.

On the issue of the dietary laws and the distinctions of clean and unclean both evangelists agree that Jesus at first refused to extend his healing ministry to persons outside the pale of Judaism, but (once more applying the principle of "greater and less") acknowledged a "purification of the heart by faith" overriding the restrictions of particularism. Both evangelists also agree that Jesus denounced the "traditions of the elders" respecting vows, ablutions and "many like things" as liable to "make the word of God of none effect." Mk extends this denunciation to the Levitical food laws, employing for the purpose a logion whose real sense will be more fully considered in connection with the theme of Book IV, but which will generally be conceded to rest upon the same basic principle of the prophets applied by Jesus to all such questions: subordination (not abolition) of the lesser matters of the Law. Mt as usual displays the utmost caution in alterations of Mk, but makes it reasonably clear that he does not share Mk's ascription of this radical step to Jesus' direct utterance. He applies the Isaian distinction of divine and human only to the Torah as against the "traditions of the elders," and in this is surely correct.

Finally, in spite of his unhistorical attribution to Jesus of a further restriction in the humane limitation of the oriental husband's un-

limited right of repudiation, a restriction which belongs more properly to the "scribe who has been made a disciple to the kingdom of heaven," Mt seems to have a better understanding than Mk of Jesus' application of the principle of weightier and lighter in his attitude toward the Law on its civil side. In the case of the Mosaic legislation on divorce, as previously in the case of the dietary laws, Mk's account suggests, if it does not compel, the idea of the Stoic principle of life according to nature.[5] Human ordinances should be subordinate to the divine teaching given through the order of the cosmos. Undeniably there is a close affinity. Nevertheless if we would not impute to Jesus a mode of thought not easily conceived as belonging to a Galilean "man of the soil" the distinction to which he is driven by the subtle question of the Pharisees was not that of the Stoic who refuses to shape his life by the conventions of current ethics and frames for himself a "higher law" dictated by philosophy.

Jesus does distinguish, just as the plain New Englander distinguishes, between honesty and "law-honesty." There is for him a higher and lower element in the Torah. All the prophets and many of the psalmists have pointed to it. In the story of Samuel and Saul he could read "I will have mercy and not sacrifice." Micah exalted judgment, mercy, and a humble walk with God as the sum total of divine requirement. Amos and Jeremiah and Isaiah repeated the lesson with varied emphasis that the contrivances of priest and scribe are a "vain worship" to offer to the Father whose real requirement is made known inwardly. Not science but conscience was the teacher of the prophets of Israel, and these in turn were the greatest teachers of Jesus. It is in the spirit of these teachers that he distinguishes in the Law, holy and righteous and good as it is, an element for the priest which regulates public worship, and an element for the magistrate evoked by the "hardness" of men's hearts, directed to the curbing of the evil-minded, "made for the lawless and unruly, for the ungodly and sinners, for the unholy and profane, for murderers, liars and perjurers." As neither priest nor lawyer Jesus is not directly concerned with either of these aspects. But he *is* directly concerned with another element, an element which reveals to the simple-minded the will of their Father in heaven. Jesus undoubtedly *knew* Leviticus, but most of his quotations are from Deuteronomy. He *had read* Ezekiel, but he revels in Isaiah.

Mk's reason for choosing the incident of the Pharisees' Enquiry as to the Law of Divorce to introduce his series of teachings setting in contrast the religion of merit and the religion of grace would seem to be the teaching of Paul, of whom the common report was that he "taught the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses,

[5] Vivere convenienter naturae.

telling them not to circumcise their children nor to obey the customs." Mk seems more concerned to justify this iconoclasm by putting Mosaism in a bad light than to do exact and historical justice to the teaching of Jesus, to say nothing of Paul. But Jesus' reply to the Pharisees' enquiry does not really condemn the Law, in spite of the collocation of Lk 16:15 and 18. It only condemns the undiscriminating use made of it by scribes and Pharisees. Likewise the contrast of merit and grace in Mk 10:13–45, infinitely superior as it is to Mt's neo-legalistic perversion [6] may easily be read in too Pauline a sense. Jesus surely did oppose the legalism of scribes and Pharisees with a doctrine of "grace." But the word "grace" has by no means as yet acquired the Pauline connotation.

Nothing could better illustrate the contrast which Jesus draws than the parable which Mt introduces into the heart of this context, in spite of the fact that he seems to give it a wrong application. With Paul "grace" stands opposed to "law," with Jesus to "merit." The incident of the Child in the Midst, of the Rich Enquirer, the apostles' claim of reward for Leaving All, and the parable of the Dissatisfied Wage-earners, all bear upon this distinction between Merit and "Grace." Jesus holds that eternal life and its connected blessings come only by "grace." Servants who have done all they were commanded cannot claim a reward; they have "done that which it was their duty to do." Pharisees who murmur at the welcome offered to tax-collectors and sinners are shamed by the example of the Elder Son envious of the Prodigal. Those who think God has no right to go beyond justice are challenged by the example of the householder rebuking the complaining worker in the vineyard with the question: "Have I not a right to do as I will with my own money? Is thine eye envious because I am generous?" This is not the Pauline contrast of Law versus grace, though it may well have led Paul to it. It is quite independent of "the word of the cross" in spite of the connection Mk seeks to establish by his anticipation of the logion of the Last Supper used as a summary in 10:45 (*cf.* 14:27 f. and Lk 22:27). It is a contrast of the "goodness" of God as the gospel ground of salvation with the "merit" laid down as the fruit of law-observance by scribes and Pharisees. A religion of "grace" of this kind was preached by Jesus with the fervor of a prophet in opposition to the binding of heavy burdens toward which he saw the book religion of the Synagogue to be drifting, and he preached it long before the shadow of the cross was thrown across his path. This same "simplicity that is in Christ" makes him the champion of the "little ones" of Galilee, while at the same time quite able to cope with the subtlest distinctions of the scribes.

[6] See above, p. 88.

iv

To sum up, then, our enquiry into Jesus' relation to the Law. It certainly was not in any sense an attitude of rejection or criticism, whether of the whole or any part. Had it been so Paul could not possibly have referred to his Master's ministry as a "ministry of the circumcision," still less have declared that he was "born of a woman, born under the Law that he might redeem them which were under the Law." Paul is completely unable to cite a single instance from the life of Jesus of disobedience, or disregard for the Law, else in such a case as the controversy over forbidden foods he would surely have cited the authority of Jesus, instead of taking the cross as the starting point of emancipation. To Paul this complete obedience of Jesus, this taking on himself the "reproach" of the people of God was just the proof of his worthiness to bring in the new system of "grace" by suffering rejection and death. Had it been otherwise "the promises made to the fathers" would not, to Paul's mind, have been fulfilled (Rom. 15:3–9). If Paul himself can cite no instance from the life of Jesus in support of his rejection of the Law, surely it is needless to enquire why the whole body of the apostles and elders in Jerusalem, ready as they were to acknowledge that the hearts of the Gentiles might be "purified by faith," were horror-struck at the idea that "the Jews which are among the Gentiles" should be emancipated from the food laws.

Jesus' attitude toward the Law is that of the great prophets and psalmists, of John the Baptist, and of many of the enlightened scribes of his time. To one of these he himself bears witness "Thou art not far from the kingdom of God." It was in answer to the scribe's appreciative reply, "Master, thou hast well said, and to love God with all the heart and understanding and strength is much more than all burnt offering and sacrifice." The utterance of Jesus on which this comment was made was an explicit avowal of the principle (by no means unknown to the teaching of contemporary scribes) of "greater" and "lesser" commandments in the Law. The complaint of Jesus against the tendencies of the Synagogue in his time was that it refused to apply this principle as the great prophets had applied it, learning their religion from the living voice of God.

Thirdly Jesus' attitude toward the Law is supremely manifest in the great discourse on Filial Righteousness, uttered to his "unchurched" following after a final breach with the Synagogue. No book, not even the Law and the Prophets, can offer a sure foundation for a man's life except in so far as it leads him to imitate the goodness of the Father in heaven, and that not outwardly but as an inborn, inbred disposition of the heart. But Jesus finds no contradiction between

the Law in its teaching to the simple-minded and the daily lessons of rain and fruitful seasons. Those who are thus taught of God are entitled to be called children of God. Unto them it is His unalterable decree to give the kingdom.

V

On the issue of Jesus and the Law, or (as we may now more accurately define it) Jesus and the Torah, that "teaching" of God which alone can imbue the utterance with real authority, two more witnesses have still to be heard. For without the testimony of the third and fourth evangelists our constructive definition of the attitude of Jesus would not be complete.

Late and remote as may be the witness of the fourth, or Hellenistic, Gospel as compared with the Synoptics, on so fundamental an issue as that of the authority of the Son of Man in comparison with that of the scribes its witness is not so remote as to have lost all touch with authentic tradition. True the element of the Galilean "men of the soil," that "unchurched" following of Jesus which the Synoptists class with the repentant "tax-collectors and sinners," has disappeared from Jn, lost below the horizon. In the Hellenistic Gospel their place is taken by the Samaritans, who without a miracle receive Jesus in simple faith at his own word, acknowledging him not merely as "a prophet" but as "the Saviour of the World" (4:19, 39–42). Nevertheless, as I showed in a recent article entitled "Sources and Method of the Fourth Evangelist" [7] the chapter following that on the Samaritan ministry is devoted to a discourse on the authority of the Son of Man, *à propos* of the miracle of the Paralytic made to Walk. The opposition of the scribes is here carried at last to the point that "the Jews sought to kill him, because he not only brake the sabbath, but also called God his own Father, making himself equal with God" (Jn 5, continued in 7:15–24), showing that this section is simply the Johannine equivalent for Mk 2:1–3:6. Both describe the Growth of Opposition to the authority claimed by Jesus as Son of Man. The culmination of the Johannine discourse comes in verses 30–47, on the "witness" borne to Jesus by Moses and Elias (represented by the Baptist) in addition to that of the Father, through the mighty works given the Son to perform. Jesus' opponents "the Jews" (here equivalent to "the scribes and Pharisees" of Mk) are denounced in verses 37–47 as champions of mere book religion, deaf to the living voice of God. Jesus here claims the witness of both Law and prophets, Moses and Elias-John, in addition to this present and living witness of God in "the works that the Father hath given me

[7] *Hibbert Journal*, XXV, 1 (Oct., 1926). See also *ibid.* XXVIII., 1 (Oct., 1929), "History and Dogma in John."

to do," but declares that the use his opponents make of the Scriptures as a means of securing to themselves "eternal life" nullifies their real value. Instead of heeding the voice of God in them "the Jews" refuse to listen to the divine Messenger to whom the Scriptures point. The book religion of the Synagogue is shown here as bent on destroying the influence of Jesus together with all who with him seek to "open the Scriptures" to the multitude. In condemnation of such book religion nothing could be more eloquent than Jesus' reply to "the Jews":

> Ye have neither heard His (the Father's) voice at any time nor seen His form. And ye have not his word abiding in you: for whom He sent, Him ye believe not. Ye search the Scriptures, because ye think that in them ye have eternal life; and these are they which bear witness of me; and ye will not come to me that ye may have life.

Jn has by no means wholly lost the ring of Jesus' hatred of a biblicism destitute of the living witness of the Spirit.

But our chief appeal should be to L, that special source of Lk on which the third evangelist has drawn for those incomparable illustrations of Jesus' doctrine of "grace" exemplified in the logion concerning the hopelessness of mere obedience to commandments as a means of accumulating "merit" (Lk 17:7–10) and the parables of the envious Elder Son (15:11–32) and the Pharisee and Publican (18:9–14). In the material drawn from this document Lk supplies us with the most illuminating illustration of Jesus' principle of divine Torah. The parable of the Good Samaritan (Lk 10:29–37), joined for some reason not yet fully explained to the story of the scribe's enquiry for the Great Commandment of the Law (Mk 12:28–34; *cf.* Lk 10:25–28), takes up the same issue as the discourse just cited from the fourth Gospel, but with better appreciation of historical conditions.

Contrary to Mk's representation of the matter, the scribe who puts the question about the Great Commandment in Lk 10:25 is not one whom the teaching of Jesus has brought close to the threshold of "the kingdom of God," but a gladiator armed against the Galilean prophet with the net of subtle logic. Jesus' answer, appended to the citation of the *Shem'a*, is the parable, of whose authenticity, albeit no other report than Lk's remains, no question can be entertained, no other author than Jesus being even imaginable. The parable is not, however, an answer, as Wellhausen has seen, to the question put by the scribe, "Who, then, is my neighbor?" For in that case victim and rescuer would have to exchange parts, the victim being aided in spite of his being a despised and outcast Samaritan. The editorial link attaching the parable to the Enquiry of the Scribe (verse 29) is therefore misconceived. The question really answered is far more fundamental.

The parable of the Good Samaritan goes to the very bottom of the real issue between Jesus and the scribes by supplying an answer to the question, Who is the authoritative interpreter of the Law?

The protagonists whom Jesus brings into the lists are not, as in the fourth Gospel, on the one side scribes, on the other Jesus himself, each claiming divine authority for the "teaching" as expounded by himself. Jesus sets over against one another on the one side priests and Levites, the official interpreters of the Law designated as such by the Scripture itself, on the other the ignorant, heretical, despised Samaritan, obedient to no Torah save the inward voice of humanity and mercy. The lesson is reflected in that Epistle which stands closest to L in the spirit of its teaching: "Who is wise and understanding among you? let him show by his good life his works in meekness of wisdom." The living Torah of a good Samaritan, on the word of Jesus, has more divine authority than that of priest or Levite who neglects "the weightier matters of the Law." It is what he *finds* in the Scriptures, not his sacerdotal or legal proficiency, which distinguishes Jesus' attitude toward the Torah from that of the scribes.

THEME II

THE APOSTOLATE

i

The theme of Mt's second Book appears in both its narrative and discourse divisions. The compilation is intended to meet the needs of the itinerant "gospeller" who in the period of the *Didaché*, some years if not decades later than this Gospel, still bore the title "apostle," notwithstanding the tendency to restrict it to the original Twelve and notwithstanding Paul's insistence on a higher sense, in which he himself had equal authority with the Galilean group, an apostleship "not from man, neither through men, but from God the Father, through Jesus Christ whom He raised from the dead." It is in the earlier, simpler, more general sense of the itinerant evangelist, sent forth by the churches in the name of the Christ to preach and to heal, that the term is here employed. What use has Mt made, and why, of the traditional sayings and doings of Jesus, to prepare such "gospellers" for their task?

The narrative Division of Book II (chh. 8 f.) consists of a series of ten Faith Wonders taken almost exclusively from Mk, but considerably abbreviated, and in an order adapted to Mt's purpose regardless of the original context. The new grouping has been explained in our introductory discussion of the Book as bearing on the lesson of Faith, a virtue to be exercised not only by the healer but by those who seek his aid. This explanation is confirmed by the material added from S of a character not connected with miracle (8:19–22), or left standing in spite of its non-miraculous character in the Markan extracts (9:9–13). This material has value in the context because it deals with Jesus' call of various disciples to the work of "gospelling" and their various response to the hardships entailed. The sections are added or retained with obvious reference to the general theme of the Book. Mt 9:14–17, The Question of Fasting, which forms a partial exception to the rule, could not well be otherwise placed because of its close connection in Mk with the preceding context. Our present concern with the reconstructed agglutination is only to observe what object Mt would appear to have in view in this rearrangement and expansion of Mk.

Two motives stand out conspicuously. The candidate for appointment to "do the work of an evangelist" must (1) show capacity for that wonder-working Faith which alone can fit him for the task of

"healing every kind of sickness and disease" (9:35). He must also (2) be prepared to "endure hardship as a good soldier of Christ Jesus" (II Tim. 4:5). The example of "Matthew" forsaking the tax-collector's office to follow Jesus (9:9–13), still more the contrasted examples of the scribe who accepts Jesus' invitation to a life of homeless wandering over against the "disciple" who wishes to postpone its inexorable demands till he shall have paid the last rites to an aged father (8:19–21), show clearly what kind of "endurance" was expected of the gospeller in the period of Mt and the Pastoral Epistles. In the period of Paul the *charisma* of "miracles" belonged to those who had "all faith, so as to remove mountains" (I Cor. 13:2). Obviously the later generation still counts this "gift" among "the signs of an apostle," with the difference that now there is resort to the example of Jesus *par excellence* as the worker of faith-wonders.

The ten mighty works of Jesus related consecutively in chh. 8 f. form thus the most appropriate possible prelude to the Discourse of ch. 10. They advance from simple healings in the first group (8:1–17) to mastery of unclean spirits (*cf.* Mk 3:15) in the second (8:18–34), and finally in 9:1–26 to actual raising of the dead to life. The appended two healings of blind and deaf-mute in 9:27–34 form something of an anti-climax, but are seemingly attached to complete a list of *ten*. We cannot safely infer from the example set that the Church of Mt's day encouraged its gospellers to attempt raising the dead in anything more than a metaphorical sense. The limitation of their instructions to preaching and *healing* (9:35) and the contemporary practice of "the elders of the church" referred to in Jas. 5:14 f., show what was expected; though claims of raising the dead in a literal sense were still made on behalf of apostles and elders not far from this time.[1]

As regards the endurance of hardship a great change is observable between the earliest time and that of Mt. Some of the Q sayings of Jesus, such as that to the willing scribe of Mt 8:19 f. set forth the sacrifice entailed in leaving all for the kingdom's sake. The disciple who sets out to "preach the kingdom of God" must expect to lead a homeless life. On the other hand not a few sayings make much of the compensations. Those who have forsaken the comforts and companionships of home in the good cause will reap a hundredfold "now in this present time" the affection of parents and friends, the peaceful enjoyment of houses and lands, while looking to "life everlasting" in the world to come. Paul himself records that Jesus expected those that preach the gospel to live of the gospel (I Cor. 8:14), adding to the current maxim "the laborer is worthy of his food" employed in I Tim. 5:18 by a Paulinist, an appeal to Moses' prohibition of the

[1] Papias as quoted by Philip of Side (Fragment V).

use of muzzles for the oxen that drag the threshing-sled over the grain heaped on the floor. The instance was doubly apposite because the technical term for the teacher employed in winnowing out from Scripture the spiritual food required by the people was a *darshan* ("thresher"), and his instruction was called "*midrash*" (the "product of threshing").

Jesus too, in a saying recorded only by Lk, referred to the friendly and hospitable reception accorded to his messengers in Galilee. He had sent them forth "without purse or hamper or shoes" depending on the recognized principle of Judaism in his day, that the religious teacher asks nothing for his services but is entitled to generous hospitality. Freedom in giving and receiving was the mark of his "liberal" profession. Jesus had appealed to this principle, deeply ingrained in the Jewish peasant, in behalf of his heralds of the kingdom of God. Results had proved that he understood the Galilean "people of the soil" and did not appeal to their generosity in vain. "Lacked ye anything" he asked of the disciples later, "when I thus sent you forth?" They answered, We lacked nothing (Lk 22:35).

But the bitter hostility encountered in Jerusalem, soon to culminate in the cross, had altered all this. "Now," says Jesus to the disciples who are about to be scattered like sheep after the shepherd has been stricken down, "now let him that has purse or hamper take it with him, and he that has no sword let him sell his garment and buy one." The warning was not meant to increase the military preparedness of his pitiful guard in Gethsemane. It was intended to forewarn the Twelve of the different reception they must henceforth expect in their work of preaching the kingdom; for this work was still to be continued (verses 36–38).

ii

Not even Q is free from the intermixture of the two types of sayings so clearly differentiated in this logion from L. The words "Behold, I send you" (ἀποστέλλω), so suggestive of the title "apostle," have led to the inappropriate placing in Lk 10:3 as well as in Mt 10:16 of the saying, "Lo, I send (ἀποστέλλω) you forth as sheep among wolves," an utterance completely unsuited to the cicumstances of Galilee and the period of the sending to which it is attached.

But Mt goes much further than either Mk or Lk in the direction of combining separate utterances not related to one another in original application into larger wholes shaped to meet the exigencies of the evangelist's time.[2] The new emphasis placed on the need to endure hardship is a striking factor of Mt's advance upon Mk and S^q. In the Discourse which we have now to discuss it goes to the extent of

[2] See von Soden, *Early Christian Literature*, p. 137 f.

attaching, after the saying about sheep among wolves, two long paragraphs on persecution and how to meet it. These paragraphs not only leave entirely behind the historical setting assumed in the first section of the Discourse (10:1–15), but so completely outweigh it in sheer mass that by the time the end is reached the reader quite forgets that the mission originally in view was that into Galilee of Mk 6:6–12, paralleled in S by Lk 10:1–12. He now slowly realizes that the subject in hand is the great tribulations that are to precede the wind-up of all things. In short Mt has drifted into his favorite theme of eschatology. He has leaped all at once from the discourse of Mk 6:1–6, where directions were given the Twelve for their mission tour in Galilee, to the discourse from the Mount of Olives of Mk 13:9–13. The subject is now the Doom of Jerusalem and Coming of the Son of Man, the horizon is no longer Galilee but "the whole inhabited world" (verse 14), the terminus in view is not the report back to Jesus of Mk 6:30 = Lk 9:10, given by S in Lk 10:17–20, but the Return of the Son of Man on the clouds of heaven.

This is, in fact, the characteristic feature of Mt's Discourse on Apostleship, that while it begins as a sending of the Twelve on their mission in Galilee it passes unobserved with the saying on sheep among wolves (verse 16) into a warning of persecution to be endured by Jesus' representatives in a hostile world after the death of their Master. The Discourse winds up, accordingly, on the same note as the great picture of the final judgment in the Eschatological Discourse.

The composition has thus ceased with verse 15 to be concerned with the situation of the original sending. Mt is not even thinking of the situation of the *second* sending related in Lk 22:35–38. He is drawing from Jesus' warnings of sufferings and persecution in store, wherever he finds them, an exhortation to the "apostles"and prophets *of his own time* to endure manfully the hatred and persecution they must expect from a hostile world. Especially are they encouraged to endure it in the assurance that deliverance is not far off at the Coming of the Son of Man. Indeed one may judge how far the original intention of the discourse is lost from view by the promise of verse 23. This the reader naturally takes as a direction to the Twelve not to carry their missionary work beyond the borders of Israel, contradictory as this would be both to verse 18 and to the closing words of the Gospel. In reality, as McNeile very properly explains, the logion is not meant for the missionaries but for the Church as a whole. The verse is peculiar to Mt, of unknown derivation, perhaps suggested by the words of the Plaint of Wisdom quoted in 23:34 predicting persecution "from city to city." But the direction not to go beyond the borders of Israel is meant "not for the band of missionaries, but the community of the disciples."

The insertion of this assurance into the Discourse on Apostleship is significant of the situation of the evangelist both in place and time. He writes at a period when the sufferings of world-wide persecution have eclipsed in his mind the thought of conditions as they were when Jesus sent the Twelve to herald in Galilee the approach of the kingdom of God. It is a time and place when in spite of temporary removal of the community of the disciples from Jerusalem such as occurred in the years 68–70, Jerusalem itself, or at least "one of the cities of Israel," could be considered the central seat of the new faith. This apostolic center is certainly not Rome. It cannot be Ephesus, or Alexandria. But neither can it be Antioch. Caesarea Stratonis might possibly come into consideration but for the evangelist's strong prejudice against the cities of Samaria. Pella might possibly belong among the places tacitly considered as temporary refuges, in spite of its Greek name, Greek institutions, and transjordanic situation. But whatever the temporary refuge permitted, the only interpretation of the strange verse which seems to do full justice to its implications is that which regards Jerusalem itself, converted and purified, as the permanent center and the scene of the impending return of the Son of Man. The church, it would seem, has been compelled by the violence of persecution such as wrought the martyrdom of James, its head, shortly before the siege, and by the greater sufferings of the war to "flee to the mountains" (24:16). But the evangelist looks for its re-establishment in Jerusalem before the final consummation; and this in a degree which shall win for "the holy city," "the city of the great King" as he calls it, world-wide recognition as seat of the apostolic mother-church. To the mind of Jewish-christian writers of orthodox tendencies such as Hegesippus the church in Jerusalem had actually regained this position of pre-eminence toward the close of the first century.

Our present task, accordingly, is two-fold. We have first to consider the opening section of the discourse (verses 1–15) observing what changes appear in the earlier directions to itinerant evangelists and prophets as now rewritten to meet the conditions of the later time; thereafter we may consider the warning of persecutions and exhortation to fearless confession introduced by verse 16 as part of Mt's eschatology; for such it clearly is.

iii

The directions to the Seventy of Lk 10:1–12 represent the most original form attainable of the logion; for comparison with Mk and Mt reveals the fact that the number "seventy" is a mere literary device adopted by Lk to make room for the account of the Sending which he found in S after having already taken over the Markan

account in chapter 9. The confirmation of this derivation from S supplied by Lk 22:35 is complete, for there the directions given in 10:4 are explicitly referred to as having been given *to the Twelve.*

Further comparison of Mk 6:6–11 shows that Mk is also dependent on the same source (S), for the slight alterations which appear are clearly intended to meet the later requirement. The original logion sets forth the principle that preparation for the journey is needless because the hospitality of the people will supply every real want. The message brooks no delay, the messenger must find provision for the journey as he goes. Such is the original sense. Mk's adaptation reflects the beginnings of complaint. Conditions have developed akin to those which evoke Paul's arraignment of the Corinthians for submitting to the impositions of certain "super-extra apostles" (ὑπερλίαν ἀπόστολοι). These interlopers had come with "letters of commendation" demanding support both for themselves and their wives, "burdening" the church as Paul himself had never burdened them. The effects of this abuse of the hospitality the churches had shown in obedience to the maxim "The laborer is worthy of his food" are indeed traceable for a full generation later. They account for the stress laid upon the particular virtue of hospitality in Hbr. 13:1, Clem. *ad Cor.* x–xii, and for the commendation of support furnished to church messengers in III Jn 5–7. They especially account for the careful regulation of the whole matter of itinerant "apostles and prophets" in *Didaché,* xi–xiii. It is significant of the growing need to restrict to a minimum what the "gospeller" might expect from his hosts, that the slight alterations of Mk from the form in which the principle was enunciated in S tend to shift the emphasis. Mk is less concerned to authorize the "apostle" to rely upon the churches for support than to limit the burden thus imposed to the barest necessities. The "apostle" may take a staff, because so simple a provision could not give rise to any suspicion of "making gain" of the churches. Except for the staff his entire outfit must be restricted to the garb of the poorest. This change of tone from S to Mk bespeaks the growing need to distinguish the truly consecrated "apostle" from those whom Paul had denounced as "false apostles."

If, then, we go back to S, availing ourselves of the back reference in Lk 22:35 f. as a counterfoil, it will be at once apparent that the effort is to establish the original principle which Paul himself makes basic as an ordinance of the Lord (I Cor. 9:14). Lk 10:1–12 represents in fuller form the teaching to which Paul refers in abstract. Jesus claims for his messengers the rights of the prophet or messenger of God which have their classical illustration in the Old Testament stories of Elijah and Elisha. In some degree the scribes had applied the principle to their own case, involving abuses such as later ap-

peared in the Church. Jesus even accuses them of "devouring widows' houses," that is, using their station as lawyers to divert to themselves the estates left for the support of widows. But he does not hesitate to claim for his own messengers the right to support from those to whom they are sent. Regulation of the burden thus imposed was left for the future. As we have seen, both the original principle and the regulation of it found confirmation in due time. S and Paul affirm the principle, Mk 6:8–10 is already affected by the need for regulation.

The detailed directions of Lk 10:4–12 with their parallels in Mt 10:7–15 (rearranged in order) are of decided interest as reflecting conditions toward the close of the first century. We note, for example, the non-appearance in Mt of the direction in Lk 10:7 that the missionary shall not attempt to maintain his own ceremonial purity of diet, but shall eat whatever his hosts set before him, asking no questions for conscience' sake. The point was covered by the logion about inward purity (Mt 23:25 f. = Lk 11:39–41). Again, the same scruples regarding the utterance of blessings on the unworthy which are openly expressed in II Jn 10 f. appear in the background of Lk 10:6 = Mt 10:12 f. But these matters of detail belong to the commentator. Our present enquiry must concern itself with Mt's eschatological addition to the discourse linked on by means of verse 16.

iv

In whatever city or village the gospeller meets a friendly reception he is first of all to "heal their sick," then to deliver his message, "The kingdom of God has come nigh to you." This is the direction given in Lk 10:8 f. = Mt 10:7 f.; its counterpart appears in verses 10–12, the directions they must follow where the reception is unfriendly. The point emphasized is the positive assurance under all circumstances, whether the reception be friendly or the reverse, that "the kingdom of God *is* nigh at hand." The closing utterance, accordingly (verse 15), which compares the fate of any city rejecting the message to that of Sodom, is not a threat of vengeance for maltreatment of the messengers but only a reiteration of the message. The gesture of shaking off the dust (raised by?) the feet is practically equivalent to that of washing the hands. The impenitent city has received its warning, the judgment that now awaits it will be heavier than that of Sodom in the days of Lot.

Mt takes this as the most suitable point at which to append the saying on sheep among wolves, together with its sequel in verses 16–39 because he assumes the unfavorable reception to be the reception actually accorded, and that not in Israel alone but throughout the world. He attaches to the saying the maxim familiar in rabbinic

teaching,[3] "Be wise as serpents and guileless as doves" because the paragraph he now compiles from Mk 13:9–13 and Lk 12:11 f. is to govern the conduct of "apostles" in the great tribulation predestined as a prelude to the consummation of all things. As we have seen, the fate of the messengers thus rejected by the unbelieving world now occupies all Mt's attention, to the complete exclusion of the earlier scene.

Verses 17–22 are taken almost *verbatim* from Mk 13:9–13, only verse 10 (=Mt 24:14) being reserved for its proper connection. But Mk had first drawn from the source employed in Lk 12:11 f. the promise of the Spirit as defendants' counsel, so that verses 19 f. may be ascribed ultimately to S. The prolepsis is compensated in Mt 24:9 by a condensed paraphrase, showing that Mt's anticipation is conscious and intentional. He is really dealing with the world-wide persecution which the Church must meet just before "the end"; for it is this final consummation to which the gospeller's endurance must hold out (verse 22). In verses 24 f. he applies the maxim "the disciple is not better than his teacher" to the fate that must be expected to befall them. Whether this application, which is followed in Jn 15:20 (*cf.* 13:16), be more authentic than that of Lk 6:40, would be hard to say. Certainly the reference to the accusation of collusion with Beelzebub (verse 25b) may safely be accredited to R.

The extract from the eschatology of S represented in Lk 12:2–12 of which the last two verses had already been borrowed by Mk (13:11= Mt 10:19 f.), is now continued in verses 26–33=Lk 12:2–9, the Exhortation to Fearless Confession. Here two sayings (verses 26 and 33) reappear in Mk 4:22 and 8:38 and one (verse 30) in Lk 21:18, an evidence of the overlapping of sources.

The same Lukan eschatology, interrupted by the discourse on Abiding Wealth (Lk 12:13–34), is continued in Lk 12:35–59. The record from which Lk derived it seems to be the principal source for Mk's Exhortation to Watch for the Coming (Mk 13:35–37=Lk 12:38–40). If this be not another case of overlapping, the logion on Division in households (Lk 12:51–53) is also the source for Mk 13:12. At least we have here a further point of contact between the Doom-chapter of Mk and this Lukan eschatology.

Mt concludes his exhortation to fearless martyrdom with Q logia calling for partings from kindred and even sacrifice of life itself as the condition of discipleship (10:37 f.=Lk 14:26 f., and 39=Lk 17:33= Mk 8:34 f.). In the former it is not unreasonable to find a motive partly accounting for the inclusion in Division A of the pair of logia which warn of these conditions (8:19–22).

It is thus apparent that Mt in the latter portion of his Discourse

[3] So in Cant. R. 2:14.

on Apostleship has passed entirely beyond the scope of the original, leaving behind him the circumstances of the sending of the Twelve into the cities of Galilee whither Jesus expected himself to come, and occupying himself with the circumstances of world-hatred surrounding the Church of his own time, and the courage of martyrdom with which they must be met. The closing paragraph of the Discourse (verses 40–42) which borrows the promises of Mk 9:37 and 41, inserts between the two a maxim not elsewhere reported (verse 41; *cf.* in Mt 13:17 "prophets and just men"). The combination forms an appropriate close for the sending, but does not suffice to conceal the patent prolepsis. The insertion of the eschatological sections can only be accounted for by the necessity Mt is under to adapt the material to the circumstances of his own time. That time has already been clearly indicated in our General Introduction as the period of world-wide persecution of the Church. As the Church's representative every gospeller must be prepared to witness a good confession "before rulers and governors" until the entire Gentile world has had opportunity of hearing the message. Endurance of martyrdom is the test to which the "apostle" of these days of the great tribulation must respond. He must go with his own cross upon his shoulders, ready to meet his Master's fate. But the time of endurance will not be long. The End is in sight. Before the persecuted Church, driven from city to city in hope of safe refuge, shall have gone over the cities of Israel, the Son of Man will have come to their deliverance. Such is the outlook for gospellers as Mt views it. Further consideration of his eschatology must be deferred to our discussion of the final theme of the Gospel, the Consummation of All Things.

V

Application of the theme of Mt's second Book to modern conditions would not be complete without some closing words on the controversial subject of miracle. For it is as "the signs of an apostle" that Mt groups together his series of ten faith-wonders to form its narrative introduction. It is also here that the widest gap appears between ancient and modern modes of thought, making it difficult for the reader of the Gospels to use their material with sincere sympathy and appreciation.

A great chasm has been opened by scientific discovery between the ancient and the modern conception of divine action. Without ignoring the vast extent of gradation between cultured and uncultured intelligence in both ancient and modern times the general difference may be expressed as follows: In ancient times divine action was conceived as capricious and individual; in modern times it is conceived as invariable and general. The reign of law has been ex-

tended to the remotest confines of an enormously extended universe. The modern view is not necessarily less religious than the ancient. To both the phenomena of nature and the events of history utter the speech of God, but the modern has come to realize that

If He thunder by law the thunder is still His voice.

This change in our mode of conceiving divine action has occasioned an almost complete disappearance of miracle from Christian apologetic. The church of Rome, it is true, still insists upon evidences of the continuation of this apostolic gift in connection with certain shrines, relics of saints, and canonization after death of certain revered communicants of its order. Protestants look upon the biblical accounts of miracle as belonging to a mode of divine revelation not available today, miracle having been superseded by methods belonging to a maturer age of humanity at a date not much later than the year 100 A.D. Needless to add that among Romanists and Protestants alike the witness of miracle is increasingly discredited as a support for the gospel message in proportion as enlightenment advances. The miracles no longer support the doctrine but the doctrine the miracles; and that not without increasing restiveness under the burden.

Exact definition is indispensable for any helpful discussion of this much debated subject. The following seems to the present writer a definition which avoids the ambiguities and other defects of many. A miracle is an unusual event, witnessed *or* reported, *interpreted* as the intervention of an extra-human spiritual personality, demonic or divine, in answer to human appeal.

The two words italicized in the above definition emphasize features commonly overlooked which are vital to the conception under discussion. (1) Almost without exception the miracles appealed to in Scripture or by the Church are *reports* of what occurred, received not at first nor even at second hand, but at an indefinite remove from the original witnesses and utterly without means of authentication. Nevertheless in speaking of biblical miracle it is surely necessary to include the vast preponderance of those which are quite unverifiable because cited merely by report, and not by the actual witnesses. (2) A mere occurrence, no matter how startling or how far transcending known human powers, is not a miracle, even to the most credulous and untutored mind, unless *interpreted* as taking place in response to some personal human emotion, usually the fear or desire of some individual or group. Examples will show the necessity for thus limiting the definition in scope.

1. The story of the raising of Eutychus from the dead in Acts 20:7–12 is exceptionally favorable from the fact that it is related by an eye-

witness. It is immeasurably better than the usual third- or fourth-hand report because in the general judgment of competent critics this portion of Acts belongs to the so-called Travel-document, the diary of a companion of Paul's journey to Jerusalem. The diarist in the light of the "many lamps" faintly illuminating the midnight darkness, *saw* Paul rush down from the third-story room, fling himself upon the prostrate form of the lad in the street below who had fallen from the window, and heard the apostle declare, as he raised himself to meet the terrified gaze of the bystanders: "Make ye no ado; for his life is in him." His mind seems to be filled with scriptural examples such as that of Elisha and the Shunammite's son (II Kings 4:32–37). It is kindled no less, we may be sure, by accounts of wonders wrought by Jesus and the apostles, including Paul himself. Accordingly our diarist assures the reader that Eutychus' life was extinct. The lad when taken up from the ground was "a corpse" (*νεκρός*). To the reporter's mind it was sufficient proof of a real resuscitation that on the morrow, when Paul set sail "they brought the lad alive and were not a little comforted." What the witness really saw must here be distinguished, obviously, from what he reports. Hence even in cases where the witness is most direct the miracle certainly depends very largely on the assumptions made, first by the witness, afterward by transmitters of the report. On the tendency of the original report to accumulate new elements of wonder in passing from mouth to mouth, and even from generation to generation, it is needless to expatiate. Here the modern sees nothing unexampled or inexplicable in the occurrence itself.

2. But marvels must also be connected in thought with some personal agency conceived as working for or against a given individual or people. Otherwise they lack that quality of superhuman direction which alone gives them evidential value. The shot from heaven must be *aimed*, not a random explosion.

Few things can be imagined more marvellous to the untaught mind of a denizen of the South Sea islands than the spectacle of a human being advancing over the frozen surface of lake or stream. If the foe he is pursuing thus escapes his spear, and no knowledge is given of the nature of the phenomenon, the savage will probably ascribe it to spirit intervention. But once let the idea penetrate his mind that it is *general*, affecting all men alike, and the inference changes. He may still ascribe the freezing of water to spiritual powers, but it ceases to have the same significance as related to his conduct or religious action. It is not a "miracle" in any sense which has apologetic value, and can only become such when connected in thought with some design affecting individual human concerns.

A biblical example would be the deliverance of Israel by crossing

the upper reaches of the Red Sea. As Napoleon's aides observed during his campaign in Egypt and Syria, a "strong east wind blowing all the night" often so far lays bare the shallows of the Bitter Lakes that Bedouin tribes familiar with the locality can cross "dry-shod." Once the crossing of Israel under leadership of Moses when escaping from the Egyptians comes to be understood as only such an unforeseen occurrence its former evidential value disappears. To make it even "providential" there must be proof of design in the exertion of the power at work. Add, then, the promise of Moses that the deliverance will be wrought, the extension of his staff, the heaping up of the waters "like a wall on their right hand and their left" and their sudden return to overwhelm the pursuing host—all features easily added by generations of poetic celebration of Israel's deliverance—and the Power shows its participation in human affairs by taking sides. It is no longer impersonal. The shot is aimed.

There is ample reason to believe that the shallows of the Bitter Lakes were exposed many times before and after Moses by "strong east winds," but until a connection was made between the phenomenon and some *personal response to human appeal* no man dreamed of regarding it as a "miracle." The *interpretation* brought in the element of personal design which distinguishes miracle from mere prodigy.

If the definition be accepted it is time to apply it to the case in hand illustrating the difference between ancient and modern ideas in this particular. Earthquakes, whether in ancient or modern times, are no respecters of persons. To the modern seismologist, and even to the man in the street, the kind of domesticated earthquake which plays favorites, clinging to the heels of individuals to intervene sympathetically in token of divine approval or disapproval, while other individuals in the immediate neighborhood appear unaware that anything unusual has happened, belongs only to the most unreal of fanciful imaginations. Yet the earthquakes which Mt introduces into the story of Calvary and Lk into the midst of the Travel document itself in Acts 16:25–34 owe all the religious value they can be imagined to have to their *discriminating* quality. Unless they show the special interest of some unseen Power in the fate of Jesus, or in the suffering in prison of Paul and Silas, the earthquakes, supposing them to have occurred, were a mere coincidence. The stories, even were it possible to overcome their intrinsic difficulties and self-contradictions, would then have no religious value whatsoever.

The ancient believed that earthquakes could be made the agencies by which demons, gods or the Creator of all evinced approval or disapproval. The modern, whether he thinks God *could* thus take part in the religious drama or not, is utterly and rightly incredulous that

God ever does intervene by any such clumsy method. The blunderbuss is not a divine weapon. Here is an insuperable difference between writer and reader. It lies in the idea of the working of God; and the modern idea is certainly the worthier of the two. How, then, can scriptural and modern faith be brought into harmony?

Accounts of apostolic and ecclesiastical miracle owe whatever religious value they possess to their interpretation as "signs." Occurrences that point to no message of any particular prophet may be as marvellous as one please, but they mean nothing, or less than nothing, to religion. Medical men may announce tomorrow a method of resuscitation applicable to ordinary men and women under many circumstances. The discovery will mean much to science, but nothing at all to the religious world,—unless some apologist attempts thereby to show that the biblical accounts of resuscitation were mere anticipations of modern physics, thereby doing his utmost to deprive them also of religious value. To have the apologetic cogency of "miracle" a resuscitation must be not only well attested but connected with a divine *purpose*.

The characteristic feature of the apostolic and gospel miracles is that they are "signs." What they are signs *of* is the proper basis of distinction. In proportion as the narrators degenerate from the simple religious standpoint of Jesus they are more and more taken as signs of *human* power to control invisible personal agencies. In proportion as we move toward the beginnings in Jesus' own simple declaration to penitent believers in his message of divine help and deliverance: "Thy faith hath healed thee, go in peace," they are detached from human and connected with *divine* intention. We attain thus to an attitude of hope and trust which reflects the spirit of Jesus, and is as uplifting morally and religiously as it is scientifically unassailable. To Mk the miracles are signs of *Jesus'* power, a degenerative tendency which goes on increasing in later writings. To Jesus, as reported in the teachings of S^q, they are signs of *God's* power accompanying and confirming Jesus' message. They are the answer sent from heaven to those who accept the message in humble faith and obedience. Consequently Jesus is neither exalted in his own estimation by their appearance (though thankful for the proof that his message is confirmed), nor depressed when the expectation of miracle is disappointed. Those who have faith ask and receive, they seek and find, they knock and find all doors opening before them. Those that have no faith find nothing.

Jesus does not feel called upon to offer a medical or psychological explanation of faith-wonders. His part is to interpret their religious significance, and this is the permanent kernel of the great discourse following the Question of John the Baptist, a discourse denouncing

the spiritual blindness of those who can see no "sign from heaven" in the beneficent effects accompanying faith in Jesus' message of "glad tidings to the poor."

Thaumaturgy ascribes religious value to mere amazement. True religious feeling sees none in it unless the marvel prompts to awe and gratitude toward some consciously beneficent Power. If ever an age was saturated with marvel it is the age of radio-activity and praeter-atomic physics. But mere marvels have not made the age in which we live religious, any more than the incredible powers which it has unlocked have made it moral. Only the exceptional scientist who looks upon his discoveries as "thinking God's thoughts after Him" is prompted by them to reverence, awe, and gratitude. The real lesson of Jesus on this question cannot be learned until men have rid themselves of the illusion of the thaumaturgist, the craving for mere wonder, as if wonder were in itself religious apart from the significance attached to its evoking cause. To Jesus this craving characterizes only an "evil and disloyal generation." To learn of him one must be rid of this illusion. One must take his standpoint of the "ear to hear and eye to see," the trustful spirit which finds "sermons in stones, books in the running brooks and God in everything." To Jesus, whirlwind, earthquake and fire might, or might not, be the vehicles of Jehovah's power. The Father's self-revelation could only be in the "still small voice."

Marvel can only teach a religious lesson when approached in this spirit. If in these times of searching criticism for the records of the past, discovery for the coming age, science should give us even larger knowledge than hitherto of the mode of operation by which that residuum of authentic faith-wonders were accomplished which historical criticism accepts from gospel story out of the mass rejected as misreport followed by legendary accretion, the new knowledge should be welcome. But it will not affect the lesson taught by Jesus both in word and action. He has but one direction to healer and healed alike: "Have faith in God." This was the open secret of his wondrous teaching, his wonder-working life, his final victory over the world and man's last enemy. "If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed" is his word to those who would follow—"if ye have faith as a grain of mustard-seed ye may say unto this mountain, Be thou removed and cast into the sea, and it shall be done for you." Psychotherapy may some day fully define faith-healing from the scientific point of view, Jesus defines it from the religious point of view—not how, or when, God's help will be given, but *that* it will be given "to him that asks in faith."

THEME III

THE HIDING AND REVELATION OF THE MYSTERY

CHURCHLY apologetic, from the earliest Christian and even from pre-Christian times down to the age of Luther, has always followed substantially the same lines. Its constant claim is

The Spirit and the gifts are ours.

Paul made this the one plea of his Gentile converts against the Judaizers. The Jerusalem church directed it against the Synagogue on the one hand, the disciples of John on the other, citing words and works of Jesus. The Synagogue itself had previously defended the claims of Judaism vs. Greek philosophy by an argument fundamentally the same: Israel the people of divine revelation, the Gentiles only groping after God in self-deluding speculation.

Matthew's third Book is constructed from materials brought together in this apologetic interest. Both S and Mk in the sections on which Mt 11–13 is based reveal it as the nucleus of their agglomerations. It is important to our appreciation of the gospel records to make this intention clear.

Separation of Church from Synagogue involved for the former the claim that believers in the gospel message were the true people of God, kindred of the Christ not according to the flesh but according to the spirit because alone obedient to the will of his Father. In view of the disobedience of the nation as a whole the supreme prerogative of Israel to be the world's hierophant, bringing to it the truths of pure religion, a "light to lighten the Gentiles," must pass from the hardened, unbelieving mass, bitterly hostile to the new faith, to the believing "remnant." These now become God's "lights in the world, holding forth the word of truth."

Paul, who thus expresses the obligation now resting on his converts, expresses also (and not without a feeling of bitterness engendered by recent persecution in the earliest writing we have from his pen) his sense of the great wrong which has compelled the separation. The sufferings endured by his Thessalonian converts at the hands of their Greek fellow-countrymen are declared in I Thess. 2:14–16 to be but an echo of those endured by "the churches of God which are in Judea," for the Jews "both killed the Lord Jesus and the prophets, and drave out us, and please not God and are contrary to all men; forbidding us

to speak to the Gentiles that they may be saved; to fill up their sins alway: but the wrath of God has at length overtaken them."

This attempt of "the Jews" to silence the "word of salvation," which God intends should be spoken to the Gentiles, is for Paul the climax of their wickedness. It was necessarily also the proof to every Christian that the ancient prerogative of Israel had now passed to "the Israel of God," a new and spiritual seed of Abraham, or (in Mt's phraseology) a nation which "brings forth the fruits" of the divine kingdom. The body of believers, endowed with the Spirit were now God's "witnesses" to the world (Acts 1:8; *cf.* Is. 43:10). Hence Mt, at the close of his account of the heralding of the message by Jesus throughout Galilee, and his further dissemination of it through the mission of the Twelve to preach and to heal, can hardly do otherwise logically than to continue his story by an account of "the stumbling of Israel at the word"; a narrative whose complement is the reception of it by the remnant of the "people of the soil," who prove themselves the true kindred of Jesus by "hearing and doing the will of God."

To convey this apologetic of the primitive Church Mt has two sources, for neither S nor Mk could fail to record in some form this basic idea. In each of these presentations the central core is a logion expressive of the divine commission to "the Son" to enlighten the darkness of heathendom with knowledge of the true God.

Division B of Mt's third Book rests chiefly on Mk, who makes this logion (Mk 4:11a) the nucleus of his individual view that the parable, so characteristic of the teaching method of Jesus, was an enigma, purposely chosen by the Lord as a means of veiling the "mystery of the kingdom" from "outsiders" while revealing it to the initiate, the spiritual kin of Jesus. Division A rests chiefly on S, represented by the Q material forming the bulk of chh. 11–12. This older document makes the same logion central to an account of the Stumbling of Israel at the word.

The Q material of Mt 11:2–12:45 begins with the Question of the Disciples of John which Jesus makes the basis for an arraignment of the spiritually deaf and blind people, who, in the person of their leaders and the mass of Synogogue adherents, have rejected both messengers of "the Wisdom of God." John, who like another Jonah had given warning of doom to the unrepentant, had met rejection and martyrdom. The Son of Man, whose winsome message of reconciliation had met similar rejection, was soon to meet John's fate. This Q context ends with the parable of the House swept and garnished, symbolic of the people of whom Jehovah had said (Zech. 2:10 f.),

> Lo, I come, and I will dwell in the midst of thee,
> And many nations shall join themselves to Jehovah in that day
> And shall be my people; and I will dwell in the midst of thee.

So far as the mass controlled by the Synagogue was concerned the Great Repentance inaugurated by the Baptist and continued by the work of Jesus had had but transitory effect. Israel had been like a man exorcised but undefended against relapse by new occupation of heart and mind. His last condition becomes seven times worse than before. Mt shows that he fully appreciates the application by attaching at the end of the parable "Even so shall it be to this evil generation" (12:45b).

The pivotal utterance of the whole long discourse (for Division A in Book III consists predominantly of discourse, being drawn almost wholly from S) is the Q version of the same logion which we have found to be pivotal in Mk, a quotation (to judge by meter and theme alike) from some Wisdom lyric celebrating Israel's prerogative as mystagogue of the nations. The speaker originally intended is Israel the "Son" of God who thus redeems his brethren: [1]

I thank Thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth,
That Thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding,
And didst reveal them unto babes:
Yea, Father, for such was the divine decree.

All revelation has been committed to me by my Father
And none knows the Son but the Father;
Nor does any know the Father save the Son,
And he to whomsoever the Son chooses to reveal Him.

This admirable adaptation from the poetry of Israel's missionary consciousness, reproduced almost identically in Lk 10:21 f., embodies the essential Christology of S. Jesus, endowed with God's Spirit of redeeming Wisdom, is this chosen "Son of God" (Mt 12:18–21; *cf.* 3:16 f.). Mt appends a third stanza based on Ecclus. li, expressive in similar terms of the invitation of "the Wisdom of God" to all the weary and heavy laden to accept her easy yoke. Both the Q quotation and Mt's supplement (in which, however, meter is disregarded), give poetic expression to the thought that the message of Jesus had been in reality the supreme utterance of that loving, redeeming, Spirit of the Wisdom of God, which in all the literature of the sages voices the yearning of Israel's Father in heaven over His wayward sons. To judge by the relation of the two connected miracles, Opening of Blind Eyes and Unstopping of Deaf Ears, to the logion on Spiritual Kin, which in the Mk version introduces the Teaching in Parables (Mk 3:31–4:9) but in the Lukan (S) form stands connected

[1] See my article "The Son as Organ of Revelation" in *HThR* for Oct., 1916 (IX, 4). For contemporary illustration of Jewish application of the terms "the Father" "the Son" to Jehovah and Israel respectively see Mechilta Ex. 12:1 quoted by Schlatter, *Matthäus*, p. 384.

with the denunciation of Israel's spiritual deafness and blindness (Lk 11:14–36), the S context made this application of the miracles. Israel is the deaf-mute and blind Servant of Is. 42:18–20; only the remnant of Wisdom's children, in whom her patience is rewarded, have "ears to hear and eyes to see." In the echo of this Isaian strain Mk and S are again found in coincidence (Mt 13:16 f. = Lk 10:23 f.; *cf.* Mk 4:9, 11 f.).

i

Because this primitive apologetic of the Church supplies the principal key to the theme of Book III as a whole it will be worth while to devote some further attention to the pre-Christian background of Jewish thought reflected in the logion as to the Hiding of the Mystery, or (as Paul expresses it in Rom. 3:1 f.) the "entrusting" to Israel of "the oracles (λόγια) of God" as their supreme prerogative.

In its earliest traceable form this doctrine appears in the exordium to the Law of Dt. 4:6–8, 32 ff., where Moses makes the possession of this divine revelation Israel's claim to a philosophy superior to that of any of the Gentile nations. In the Isaian doctrine of the Servant-witness it becomes central, as we have seen. Only as "the people of the book" could the powerless remnant in post-exilic days aspire to world-pre-eminence. By common consent of all interpreters of Is. 40–66, chief inspired Scripture for the earliest Christians, it is the glory of this anonymous but matchless poet to have held up a new standard of hope to his enfeebled and discouraged countrymen. Deutero-Isaiah, as we clumsily designate the poet, reminds Israel of their divine calling to be "a light to lighten the Gentiles." Jehovah's "witnesses," a martyr people scattered among the Gentiles, would prove through their very sufferings a healing power for the world; by their knowledge (of the true God) they would bring many to righteousness (Is. 53:11).

This noble ideal of the last of the great prophets is not lost sight of in the days of the "wise men" or sages, whose literature succeeds to that of prophecy. Israel is the sole abode of the divine Wisdom, which has vainly sought a resting place among the Gentiles, as Noah's dove flying over the watery waste had been at last compelled to return to him in the ark. This is the constant theme of the Wisdom lyrics from Ecclus. 24 to Bar. 3:9–4:5. This divine "wisdom" of revelation is always more or less closely identified with the Torah, though under this term is included more than the letter of the Mosaic books. To the wisdom writers the Law and the prophets are included under the general term Torah in its literal meaning of divine "teaching." By virtue of her "prophets, sages and scribes" Israel is Jehovah's "disciple," wakened morning by morning to listen with opened ear to

the divine message for the benefit of the weary and heavy laden (Is. 50:4).

Neither is the vision lost sight of in the still later days of apocalyptists and scribes. The *Assumption of Moses*, a writing still recent in the days of Paul and quoted in Jude 9, places in the mouth of its hero, Moses, at his parting from Joshua immediately before his "taking up," this claim to be the divinely appointed "mediator" between God and mankind. The title is applied by virtue of the revelation received by Moses in the creation story:

> For He (God) created the world on behalf of His own people. But He was not pleased to make known this origin of the creation from the beginning of the world, in order that the Gentiles might dispute about it and be humbled in convicting one another by their arguments. Therefore He ordained and devised me, whom He had prepared from the foundation of the world, that I should be the mediator of His covenant.

As is well known, Philo presents Genesis in all seriousness as the real source on which even Plato and the Greek philosophers depend for whatever true insight they have into the mystery of the creative purpose of God. Paul, likewise, holds that the wisdom of this world is peculiarly convicted of folly in this particular respect, the vain attempt of Gentile philosophy to explain the purpose of God in creation. Only those who have the Spirit of God, that Spirit which had inspired and controlled the thought of Jesus, says Paul, can bear true witness to the destiny of the creation. Not heathen cosmology, then, but Christian "prophecy" is qualified to reveal "the things which God hath prepared for those that love Him." This knowledge of "the things with which we are graciously endowed by God" as His sons and heirs is supplied by "the Spirit." In such utterances of the Spirit God's purpose may be known, just as among men none is competent to declare a man's intentions save the spirit which is in the man himself (I Cor. 1:18–2:16).

But it is not from Christian sources that Akiba, scribe and martyr of the days of our evangelist, learns his argument for Israel as God's hierophant, His "Son" in the special sense of the priest-nation, organ of divine revelation. *Pirqe Aboth* III, 18 gives Akiba's explanation of Israel's claim to the title "Son of God" in a special sense, as God's "Only-begotten" or "Beloved." As will be seen it rests upon three passages of Scripture, Gen. 9:6; Dt. 14:1, and Prov. 4:2, in which a distinction is made between the general sense under which all men may claim the title and the special sense applicable to Israel alone. Akiba rests this claim solely on the divine revelation with which Israel has been entrusted, particularly its revelation of the purpose of the creation:

> Akiba used to say: Beloved are mankind, for man was created in the image of God. But *the revealing to him* that he was created in the image of God was a mark of special love, as it is said " In the image of God created He him." Beloved are Israel, for they were called children of the All-present; but it was by a special love that this was *revealed to them*, as it is said: "Ye (in distinction from the heathen) are the children of Jehovah, your God." Beloved are Israel, for unto them was given the coveted instrument (of the Torah); but it was by a special love that it was *revealed to them* that that coveted instrument was theirs through which the world was created, as it is said, " For to you I give good teaching; forsake ye not my Torah."

The converse of this doctrine of the divine enlightenment of Israel is the hiding of the revelation from the heathen world, and this naturally is equally insisted upon. As Paul puts it, "When in the wisdom of God the world through its wisdom knew not God, it was God's good-pleasure (inscrutable decree) through the foolishness of the preaching to save them that believe." This is only a Christian adaptation of the classic expression of Jewish belief already given from the *Assumption of Moses*, or (again in Paul's language) the belief that "God chose the foolish things of the world that He might put to shame them that are wise."

It is expressed in a thoroughly Jewish (though in date post-Christian) rendering of Is. 24:16: "My mystery belongs to me and to those who are mine." Paul's frequent references to the "hiding of the mystery," that is, the divine concealment even from the angels (I Pt. 1:12; *cf. Slav. Enoch* xxiv. 3) of the purpose and meaning of the creation from the foundation of the world, in passages such as Rom. 16:25 f.; I Cor. 2:10; Eph. 3:5, and II Tim. 2:19, are therefore mere adaptations of a completely classical Jewish idea. There is no need whatever to imagine, as some excellent scholars have done, a literary dependence of Paul on the Q logion Mt 11:25–27 = Lk 10:21 f., in his fullest expression of the doctrine in I Cor. 1:18–2:16, because neither Paul nor the precanonical evangelist is strictly original. The doctrine of the hiding of God's revelation, or "mystery," from all save the children of His household was already ancient before Paul's time, to say nothing of our earliest Gospels. For this reason we find the logion itself in most varied forms both canonical and uncanonical.[2]

ii

Our first knowledge of the application of this doctrine of the Hiding of the Revelation in primitive Christian apologetic is of course derived from Paul, who closes the systematic exposition of his "gos-

[2] Besides the variants in Mk and Q we have that of an unnamed gospel cited by Clement, *Strom.* V, x. 19 and another in *Clem. Hom.* XIX, xx.

pel" to the Roman church by three chapters (Rom. 9–11) devoted to proving the displacement of Israel by the Church as agent of God in the world's salvation. In this argument Paul naturally resorts to the complaint of Isaiah. The prophet complains that he is sent to a people who have closed eyes and ears against his message (Is 6:8–12). To Paul's view Israel's rejection of the gospel can be accounted for only as a fulfilment of such predictions, specifically those of Isaiah and David. The "elect remnant" had indeed welcomed the gospel; but as for the rest "God gave them a spirit of stupor, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear, unto this very day" (Rom. 11:7–10 quoting Is. 29:10 in combination with Dt. 29:4). The Jews' insistence on their dietary laws as a ground of "purity" Paul considers to be foreshadowed in the Psalm from which Mt derives the Scripture fulfilment "they gave me gall and vinegar to drink" (Mt 27:34, 48; *cf.* Ps. 69:22), which continues:

> Let their table be made a snare and a trap,
> And a stumblingblock and a recompense unto them.

Paul supplements this with further Psalm passages,

> Let their eyes be darkened that they may not see,
> And bow Thou down their back alway.

Thus from the beginning the Church counters Israel's claim to be the people of revelation, God's hierophant to a lost world, by means of the complaint uttered by lawgiver, prophet, and psalmist alike that this appointed messenger of Jehovah is spiritually deaf and blind. Paul's individual contribution to the classic apologetic seems to be chiefly a stricter application to it of the Pharisean doctrine of predestination (Israel's "hardening" foreordained on the Gentiles' account), and the assurance that in the end conditions will be reversed and Israel, provoked to jealousy by Gentile faith, will repent and be restored to their position of elder sonship. What now of the Gospel writers?

As we have seen, the two earliest attempts that we know of to support the primitive apologetic by the record of Jesus' sayings and doings take divergent roads. S, which begins with the Question of John's Disciples, uses this as the basis for an appeal to the "works of the Christ." Jesus' answer to the question is a reference to his healings and his liberation of Satan's captives as fulfilling Isaiah's promises of redemption for Israel in her misery, poverty and the prison darkness of death. Such works cannot justly be ascribed to any other agency than the Spirit (Lk "finger") of God. Jesus follows up this appeal to his "mighty works" with a denunciation of Capernaum, Bethsaida, and other "cities where most of his mighty works were done," be-

cause they repented not. He also denounces Israel as a whole as a generation spiritually blind and deaf, which has refused the message of both God's messengers, the Baptist's, and his own. In this Q development the chief emphasis inevitably falls upon the *works* of the Christ, because the starting point was the answer to John's disciples, an answer peculiarly adapted to the Church's relation to this sect inasmuch as it was admitted that "John did no miracle," whereas the gift of "miracles" was one of those evidences of "the Spirit" which uniformly accompanied Christian baptism, distinguishing it from the Johannine rite. The theme appears to have been continued in S by a charge of Spiritual Blindness brought against those who demanded a Sign from Heaven (Mt 12:22 ff. = Lk 11:14 ff.).

It is probably due to influence from Paul that in Mk another branch of the tradition is followed, with the result that in Book II Mt reverses the usual rôle of his two main sources. Division A draws chiefly from S because in this instance S makes appeal to the "doings." Mk, on the other hand, following the lead of Paul's apologetic, takes the Parables of the Kingdom as his evidence that Jesus met the obduracy of his kindred after the flesh by a method of teaching such that only they who had "ears to hear" received "the mystery of the kingdom," whereas the "outsiders" had fulfilled to them the Isaian prediction. Mk's chapter of Parables (Mk 3:31–4:34) thus becomes the natural basis for the Discourse of Division B. At all events Mk follows the example of Paul in disregarding here the charge of spiritual blindness and concentrating on that of deafness to the word. Mk reserves the accusation of spiritual blindness for another context (Mk 8:10–26) though traces remain. For he interjects in 3:22–30 a condensed report of the Blasphemy of the scribes at the work of the Spirit (*cf.* Mt 12:22–37 = Lk 11:14–23; 12:10) and in 4:21–23 a Q logion on Hiding the Light.

Mk's separate treatment of the two branches of the apologetic had serious effects, as we shall see, on the tradition as transcribed by Mt and Lk, and may reasonably be ascribed to indirect influence from Paul. In Paul's apologetic the mighty works of Jesus play no part, for the simple reason that these "gifts of the Spirit" are considered as still manifested in the "signs of an apostle." Israel's rejection of the word, however, is to Paul, as we have seen, a manifest token of divine hardening. God had given them "a spirit of stupor, eyes that they should not see and ears that they should not hear." However, the theory that parables are enigmas and that Jesus used these transparent illustrations to veil his message from his kindred after the flesh while revealing it to the select group of his disciples, cannot justly be ascribed to Paul. This extraordinary idea seems to be a special contribution of Mk's own.

iii

We may perhaps regard the make-up of S and Mk respectively in Mt's third Book as covered in the main by the introductory analysis specially directed to this aspect of the question. As we have seen, Mt presents the usual elements of Narrative (Division A) and Discourse (Division B). Division A easily falls into two parts, of which the first (ch. 11) closes with the Hymn of Revelation already described. The second (ch. 12) leads over to Division B by an account of the Opposition of Scribes and Pharisees which drew upon the nation its doom, a forfeiture of the right to be called the children of God in favor of the new heirs, those who under the leadership of the chosen Servant would "proclaim true religion to the Gentiles." With this object in view (clearly expressed in the quotation from Is. 42:1–3, Hebr, expanded to include 4b, LXX, in verses 17–21) Mt combines a Markan and a Q element, each charging the Pharisees (in 12:38 "scribes and Pharisees") with the guilt of this opposition.

The Markan material occupies the beginning and end of the chapter, verses 1–16 transcribing from Mk 2:22–3:6 the two stories of conflict with the Pharisees over sabbath observance which form the climax of Mk's section on the Growth of Opposition, while verses 46–50 present Mk's paraphrase of the S logion on Spiritual Kin, for Mk 3:31–35 is only an adaptation of the logion recorded in Lk 11:27 f., an adaptation characterized by Mk's usual abundance of descriptive detail.

The Q material supplies the remainder of the indictment in a fuller and more intelligible version than Mk's of the Blasphemy of the Scribes against the work of God (verses 22–30 = Lk 11:17–23) expanded by additions from Mk and S expressive of Mt's hatred of the Synagogue leaders (verses 31–37), and brought to an appropriate close by two paragraphs which have better connection as placed by Lk, the Demand for a Sign (12:38–42 = Lk 11:16, 29–32) and the parable of the House Swept and Garnished (Lk 11:24–26).

These two paragraphs continue the thought of the reproach for the rejection of God's two messengers, John and Jesus, John's warning of judgment being compared to Jonah's at Nineveh and Jesus' winning entreaty to the wisdom of Solomon. The evil generation which has rejected them forfeits God's promise to "dwell among them." The abode of His Wisdom-spirit instead of being in readiness for Him has become the haunt of every evil spirit. The S introduction to these two paragraphs was a brief account of the Exorcism of a Dumb Devil (Mt 12:22–24 = Mk 3:20–22 = Lk 11:14 f.) which was perhaps associated with a second miracle of opening of blind eyes (*cf.* Mt 12:22 "*blind and* deaf-mute," "spake *and saw*" and the

coupling of the two healings in Mt 9:27–33 (34) and Mk 7:31–8:26). Mt places them at the end of Division B instead of after 11:7–19 because they condemn the "evil and adulterous generation."

Division B adopts and re-enforces Mk's theory of the parables as a means of Hiding the Mystery from the evil generation who are Jesus' kindred only according to the flesh, while revealing it to his kindred according to the spirit. Mt not only takes up the idea, expanding the group from three Parables of the Kingdom to seven, but finds in Ps. 78:2, LXX, (cited erroneously as from "Isaiah") a further reference to the use of "parables" to reveal the mystery "hid from the foundation of the world."

The basis of Mk's discourse in parables is an answer to the Blasphemy of the Scribes, which had been evoked (in S) by the popular plaudits at Jesus' Exorcism of a Dumb Devil. Jesus had replied with the charge of Spiritual Deafness. He sustains it by the parable of the Sower (Mk 4:1–9) addressed to those that "have ears to hear." This is followed by an Interpretation (verses 10–20), probably the work of S, into which Mk inserts his own adaptation of the logion on Hiding the Mystery of the kingdom (verses 11 f.). The parable in its Markan form has proved so acceptable to both Mt and Lk that neither has preserved the S equivalent. Consequently we can only conjecture Mk's dependence on it. The conjecture gains probability, however, from two facts (1) that Mk interjects an alien element in 4:11 f.; (2) that a parable of this type, contrasting the harvest to be reaped from the "good and honest soil" with the disappointments resulting from those who for various reasons turn a deaf ear to the message, supplies exactly the sequel to be expected after the complaints uttered in the earlier Q context against the "evil generation" which has refused to listen to both God's messengers (Mt 11:16–19 = Lk 7:31–35).

We have seen reason to believe that in S an Opening of Blind Eyes was included in the context. However this may be, Mk's continuation of the theme is dominated by his own conception of the Hiding of the Mystery *by the use of parable.* Unlike Lk, who seems to take the parable of the Sower as teaching the doctrine of the Elect Remnant and brings the subject to a close with the logion on Spiritual Kin (Mk form) transposed from before the parable (Lk 8:4–21), Mk appends first a loosely agglutinated group of logia on Bringing in the Light and Hearing the Word with diligence (verses 21–25), thereafter two further Parables of the Kingdom (verses 26–32) which the closing summary (verses 33 f.) intimates are given as examples of how Jesus used this method of veiling the truth from all but the elect.

This Markan theory does not seem to appeal to Lk although in 8:10 he transcribes in part Mk's Scripture fulfilment; for only one

of Mk's two supplementary parables of the kingdom appears in Lk, and that not in the Markan connection. The Mustard Seed and the Leaven are given together by Lk in 13:18–21 in what appears to be their original connection and application. We are therefore safe in concluding that both the inserted logion on the Hiding of the Mystery, which interrupts the connection of Mk 4:10 with verses 13–20, and the appended logia and supplementary parables of verses 21–25, 26–32, all of which the evangelist represents as uttered after the departure of the multitude (*cf.* verse 10), are attachments of his own, not originally related to the parable of the Sower with which the discourse began. It is of some interest to note, however, that the group of attached Q logia (Mk 4:21–25) which Mt gives only [3] in their Q context, seems to be made up with reference to both branches of the S apologetic (4:21 = Mt 5:15 = Lk 11:33; 4:22 = Mt 10:26 = Lk 12:2; 4:25 = Mt 25:29 = Lk 19:26).

Our present endeavor is to trace back the teaching to Jesus himself, pausing no longer with the varieties of transmission than is needful to get at the full original sense. We have tried to make it apparent that Mk's postponement of that branch of the teaching which has to do with the *blindness* of the Servant is probably a secondary development, because elsewhere the two phases of Jesus' indictment of the "evil generation," its deafness to the word and its blindness to the signs of divine intervention, are found interwoven. Such is clearly the case in Mk's own resumption of the theme in his Exile section, where the second Sign of the Loaves with its sequel the Demand for a Sign (Mk 8:1–13: *cf.* Jn 6:1–21, 22–40) stands between the Unstopping of Deaf Ears (7:31–37) and the Opening of Blind Eyes (8:22–26). As we have just seen, traces are not wanting even in Mk's Discourse in Parables (4:1–34) that spiritual blindness once belonged to the indictment. However, it is to the other Gospels that we must turn for really convincing evidence that the primitive record linked the two together.

1. Certainly the fullest and most elaborate development of this branch of the apologetic is that which in Jn 9:1–41; 10:19–21 links together the Blasphemy of the Scribes (9:41; 10:19–21; *cf.* Mk 3:22–30) and the Opening of Blind Eyes (9:1–34; *cf.* Mk 8:22–26). The man whose eyes Jesus has opened but whom the Pharisees have cast out from the synagogue as a "sinner" stands opposed to the Pharisees who are spiritually blind. Jesus pronounces these guilty of unforgivable sin because in declaring the Saviour himself a sinner and his work of deliverance an effect of demon-possession they have consciously sinned against the light (9:39–41).

[3] Mk 4:25 forms a partial exception. It occurs twice in Mt, once in the Markan context (13:12) once in that of Q (25:29).

2. Although the actual healing fails to appear in Lk, perhaps because of his effort to avoid even the appearance of duplicating 18:35–43, the section beginning with the Exorcism of the Dumb Devil (Lk 11:14–36) has many indications that spiritual blindness was part of the indictment of the "evil generation." The Demand for a Sign (11:16), here as elsewhere, stands connected with the Blasphemy of the Scribes who ascribe the Exorcism of the Dumb Devil to collusion with Beelzebub. In the eschatology which follows in 12:54–56 it is answered by the charge of spiritual blindness in not being able to read the "signs of the times," a passage which some texts attach to Mt 16:1 f. from some extra-canonical source. Even with no more definite reference to actual opening of blind eyes than Lk 7:22 it seems reasonable to hold that the substance of Mk 8:22–26 once stood as part of the context of Lk 11:29–36.

3. Besides the habitual linking together of the Exorcism of the Dumb Devil and Opening of Blind Eyes as an inseparable pair exemplified in Mt 9:27–33 and again in the editorial touches of 12:22, Mt introduces immediately after Mk's quotation of Isaiah's characterization of Israel as spiritually deaf and blind a Q logion addressed to the Twelve as follows:

> But blessed are your eyes for they see; and your ears for they hear. For I give you my word, Many prophets and just men have longed to see the things which ye see, and saw them not; and to hear the things which ye hear, and heard them not (Mt 13:16 f. = Lk 10:23 f.).

The things which "prophets and just men" (for the expression *cf.* 10:41) longed in vain to see can only be the gracious tokens of the coming kingdom which Jesus had bidden John's disciples report to their master. The disciples who witness them are congratulated because they appreciate their blessed significance. The unbelieving Pharisees who shut their eyes to the "signs of the times," gracious and sinister alike, and blindly ask for "a sign from heaven"—still more the scribes who ascribe the gracious work of "the Spirit of God" to Beelzebub—are in the position of the religious leaders denounced in Is. 29:10, blind leaders of the blind. It is true that Lk 10:23 f. slightly postpones this Q logion, attaching it to the Return of the Seventy. But Mt's connection at least deserves consideration. If this was the original context of the logion in S we have a further link establishing the line of thought of the original discourse. Jesus answered the accusation "He casteth out by Beelzebub" not merely with a *tu quoque*, but offered the works of healing as evidences of the intervention of the Stronger than the Strong Man Armed. By the Stronger, however, Jesus does not mean himself, as Mk appears to assume, and as modern commentators imagine. He is appealing to the glorious

promise of Is. 49:22–26 that "Jehovah himself" will come to the deliverance of his captive people from their seemingly all-powerful foes. Jesus' "mighty works" are not his own, and if the charge had been uttered against the Son of Man only it could have been pardoned. But the blasphemy was uttered against "the Spirit of God," a conscious calling of evil good and good evil. Therefore it can never be forgiven.

Proceeding from this vantage point Jesus launches a further attack. His opponents demand "a sign from heaven." This is refused with the example of Jonah, whose warning of doom to the unrepentant was humbly accepted by the Ninevites without miraculous attestation. Those who ask this prove their own blindness because ample tokens have been given to those that have eyes to see. Those who have faith in God's promise have only to look about them. The dead nation has been roused from its torpor by the Elijah-like preaching of John, the poor now hear glad tidings, the lame walk, lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear and blind eyes are opened. Only those who will not see and will not hear stand in the way of the Spirit (Lk the "finger") of God.

Comparison of all four of our Gospels enables the careful student to restore the substance of this line of argument, which, however scattered in later application, must represent in general outline the tradition of S. Mk's subdivision of the material permitting his own peculiar application of the apologetic to the teaching in parables is no more than a side issue as compared with the larger line of thought. It belittles the real conception as effectively as his handling of Jesus' reply to the Blasphemy of the Scribes. That which we recover by comparison of all four of our witnesses is a sublimely religious application of the great themes of Isaiah: Jehovah himself has drawn near by His Spirit for the deliverance of his captive people. But He encounters only deaf ears and blind eyes among their leaders.

Is it possible to trace the dominant thoughts of Jesus himself behind the applications of his teaching made by the primitive Church in defense of their claim that God had transferred to the Church through its endowment with the Spirit the stewardship of His mysteries?

iv

It seems to be difficult for the modern reader of the Gospels to rid himself of the idea that Jesus offered the "word of wisdom" which he proclaimed as a witness to *his own* superhuman knowledge, and the "word of power" by which his healings and mighty works were accomplished as proof of *his own* supernatural greatness. Yet this is certainly not the representation of the earliest and most authentic sources, although it must be admitted that the tendency increasingly manifests itself in the later reports to place Jesus in the less religious

and more self-exalting attitude. We have had occasion to notice this tendency in Mk, it becomes overmastering in Jn. In such modern mistranslations as "a greater One than Solomon is here," or such misinterpretations as those usually applied to the Psalm of Thanksgiving for the Revelation of the Fatherhood, we have abundant evidence that the primitive sense is not yet appreciated. The remedy for such misunderstanding is a more historical conception of the doctrine of the Spirit as applied throughout the Old Testament to the words and deeds of the prophets, and by Jesus himself to his own work and to that of his predecessor in the proclamation of the advent of the kingdom.

Our oldest witnesses are definite and positive in their representation that the wisdom and power in question are "the wisdom of God and the power of God" (I Cor. 1:24). In Acts the apostles are not more explicit in refusing to regard miracle as a personal belonging than in ascribing the same attitude to Jesus. "Why look ye upon us," says Peter to the crowds astonished at the healing of the lame man in the temple, "why look ye upon us, as though by our own power or godliness we had made him to walk?" (Acts 3:12). Jesus was a man whom "God anointed with the Holy Spirit and with power, so that he went about doing good, healing all that were under the tyranny of the devil; *because God was with him.*" Even his raising from the dead is most explicitly referred to the power of God in distinction from any ascribed to Jesus himself. Converts are "believers in God, which raised him from the dead and gave him glory (that is, a glorified body), *so that your faith and hope might be in God*" (I Pt. 1:21).

If even our evangelists still show some care to observe this distinction, ascribing the healings of Jesus, and their own as well, to the "finger" or "hand" of God (Lk 11:20; Acts 4:30), and explaining in general terms that "the power of God was with him to heal" (Lk 5:17), it is not to be imagined that Jesus himself left room for doubt as to the Source whence this power flowed. Indeed the whole point of the distinction made in his reply to the Blasphemy of the Scribes between utterances against himself and utterances against the work of God is completely lost unless this fundamental truth be recognized. In the specific case of the Exorcism of the Dumb Devil there could by no possibility be any accusation of blasphemy which to the multitude would have the least savor of right or reason except as Jesus could make it appear that the work was not his own but God's. Hence the strong expressions "finger" or "Spirit of God" and the demand "By whom do your sons exorcise?" In the generalizing parable of the Strong Deliverer it is a complete degradation of the sense not to see that Jesus is speaking of the deliverance promised in Is. 49:24–26 to be effected by "Jehovah *Himself*" just because no other can prevail

against foes so mighty. Peter also, in Acts 10:38, is perfectly explicit in ascribing this deliverance from the "tyranny" of Satan to the power of God who worked "with" Jesus. Certainly the interpretation which ignores this distinction, and assumes that Jesus boasts of *his own* miraculous power and speaks of *himself* as victor over the power of Satan, has no claim to be considered authentic in view of these testimonies.

The same is true with regard to the message proclaimed. Even were we not justified in regarding the Thanksgiving for the Revelation as a *quoted* Wisdom lyric, it would still be inadmissible to interpret the poem otherwise than the parallels cited from contemporary and earlier Jewish literature require. If one can imagine Jesus as actually offering such a thanksgiving it could only be as representative of the "little ones," who in distinction from the wise and understanding are "taught of God." The revelation spoken of in the poem is what the apostolic age designates a "gift of the Spirit"; it is *gnosis*, an insight divinely bestowed upon the "prophet" into "all mysteries and all knowledge" (I Cor. 13:2). We can imagine Jesus speaking on behalf of those who have humbly and gratefully accepted the glad tidings, offering thanks to the "Lord of heaven and earth" for His message to the "babes," and making this sonship of adoption, this sonship based upon the Spirit and not upon mere national or racial claims, a missionary call to enlighten the world. We cannot, in justice to his uniform attitude of simple obedience and humble faith in his Father, imagine Jesus as exalting his own Sonship in any sense not shared by all the children of divine Wisdom.

If, then, we put the question as formulated by Mt in the passage immediately succeeding to this Book on the Hiding of the Revelation, "Whence hath this man this wisdom and these mighty works?" (Mt 13:54) the answer must be that while it is quite possible that Mt himself would answer the question in the same manner as Mk from whom he transcribes it, nevertheless the earlier and more authentic witness preserves the distinction. It is "the wisdom of God and the power of God."

V

An admirable discussion of the question "Jesus and the Spirit" (*Jesus und der Geist*) is published by Professor Hans Windisch of Leiden, in the volume of *Studies in Early Christianity* (1928) edited by Professor S. J. Case and presented to Professor F. C. Porter and the present writer. It raises serious question whether the meager testimony to words of Jesus promising or referring to the gift of the Spirit justifies the belief that the apostolic claims were not largely an afterthought. Now it cannot be denied that the verbal evidence is

slender. The later tendency is exemplified in *Ev. Naz.*, which presents Jesus as "anointed with the Spirit" at his baptism in a sense which made him depositary of "the whole fountain" of the *charismata* known to the Church, the permanent "resting-place" of the Spirit which had found temporary abode in the prophets. This tendency superseded the earlier and simpler represented in the conceptions of Jesus' Galilean following. To his own contemporaries Jesus was simply the "prophet of Nazareth." Like the prophets of pre-synagogue days he "speaks with authority and not as the scribes." He is endowed with the prophet's superhuman "powers," the "word of wisdom and the word of power." But this is simply because "God was with him."

Jesus' view is of the same religious type. Because he has a sense of divine "sending" like that so emphatically put forward by the great prophets of the ancient time his inward experience at the time of his baptism by John becomes a sustaining power throughout his ministry, though he does not act upon this vocation until the Baptist's work is cut short by Antipas. To Jesus as to the mass of the people, John was "a prophet like one of the prophets." If Jesus went beyond this general verdict to proclaim John's mission a "greater" than those of the former time could claim, it was because this mission seemed to fulfil the promise of Mal. 4:4–6 of a last Great Repentance, turning the heart of the children to the Father and the Father to the children,[4] as when Elijah at Carmel "turned the heart of Israel back again" from following the *baalim*. Without this Great Repentance the coming great and terrible Day of Jehovah, would prove a curse instead of a blessing. Because his message of warning is ultimate, because he voices Jehovah's last summons to erring Israel before the great Day, John is to Jesus "greater" even than Elijah, something "more than a prophet."

The message when taken up by Jesus himself cannot be spoken with *less* authority. If John's authority was "from heaven" that of Jesus cannot be less so. But the authority, whether in word or action, is derived from the message, not conversely. Whoso receives any bearer of this message commissioned by Jesus receives the Commissioner, and whoso receives Jesus receives Him that sent him (Mk 9:37). Here is the ultimate origin of Paul's claim to be "an apostle not from men but from God."

In one respect the prophetic authority of Jesus is superior to John's; at least it receives (so unexpectedly to himself that his work is suddenly diverted to new scenes) an added confirmation in the "mighty works" of healing and "deliverance from the tyranny of Satan" which appeared from the very outset of his ministry in Galilee, as a proof that "God was with him" (Mk 1:21–39; *cf.* Jn 3:2).

[4] The reading followed in Ecclus. 48:10.

All accounts agree that no such phenomena had attended the baptism of John. To Jesus the exorcisms (of which the first at least was unsought), with the healings which followed, were not only a confirmation of the message (and authority) which he had taken over from John, but an assurance that the warning to "Repent" was not without that assurance of divine forgiveness which forms its constant complement in all the prophets.

No rabbi would hesitate for a moment to give this assurance to every true penitent; but to give it "with *authority*" one must be the conscious bearer of a special message from the God who to Israel was He "that forgiveth all thine iniquities and healeth all thy diseases"; for healing and forgiveness of sin are inseparable in the teaching both of the Synagogue and of the early Church. When, therefore, Jesus commissions the Twelve to heal they are also commissioned to proclaim the forgiveness of sins (Jn 20:23). The elders of the Church also regularly exercised the gift of healing in similar association with prayer, anointing with oil and laying on of hands. So also did the rabbi. The difference which leads the Church to incorporate in its earliest baptismal symbol the special clause "I believe in the forgiveness of sins" is the sense of authority conveyed by the assurance of *special commission.* To Jesus the fact that the deliverance of his message of repentance had been accompanied so unexpectedly by these phenomena of healing among those who received it in penitent faith gave an added touch of authority. It confirmed the "sending," it was "apostolic." At the same time it also gave the message a more gracious and winning quality. God had "stretched forth his hand to heal," as the Twelve later supplicate that He will do in their case (Acts 4:30). It transformed the threat of "wrath" into a "gospel of peace." It was a token that the Great Repentance already begun would not be in vain. This note of difference from the austere message of John is not forgotten in the Church's apologetic.

The story of the Question of John's Disciples is admirably chosen to lead off in the comparison of the authority of John with that of the Son of Man which forms the basis of Division A in Mt's third Book because it not only serves as an answer to that important body of "disciples of John" who in apostolic and post-apostolic days continued to exalt their own baptism, barren as it was of the "gifts of the Spirit," over against that practiced by the Church, but because it truly exhibits this difference of the "glad tidings to the poor" which gave to Jesus' message the tone of wedding bells, as compared with the harsh warnings of his predecessor. The form of the question, "Art thou he that should come?", and of the final clause of the answer, "Blessed is he that shall not fall back from me" may well be dictated by the special interest of the precanonical evangelist to

overcome all doubt of Jesus' claims as Christ and Son of Man; but the historical nucleus is unassailable just because it presents so clearly, and in a manner so far from self-exaltation, Jesus' real sense of his divine commission.

What John sought and needed was assurance that his own prophetic work was being carried on. The message Jesus sends is that of a divine encouragement. "Yes, says the Nazarene, it is being carried on, and more. The great Repentance has begun. The lost sheep are being rallied to the standard of the Kingdom; and not only so, but God's 'finger' has been stretched forth to heal, an assurance 'from heaven and not from men' that the power of the Strong Man is already breaking before the Stronger than he. Satan is being cast out. But not by Beelzebub. Not by any human power. The God of Israel has Himself drawn near to open blind eyes, to unstop deaf ears, to cleanse the lepers and make the lame to walk. The misery of the captive people is cheered by glad tidings of liberation, they are already rising from the darkness of their tomb." Such is the nature of the message of comfort the greater Prophet sends to his beloved leader of earlier times, to cheer him for the martyrdom he is soon to face.

Our interest is like that which leads the evangelist to turn from the message Jesus sends to John and face its implications as regards his own sense of divine authority. Jesus makes the incident the occasion for a rebuke to the leaders and adherents of the Synagogue who have turned a deaf ear to his message and refused to see in the spectacle of the penitent multitude, blessed with healing according to their faith, any "sign from heaven."

Of the reality of the phenomena of faith-healing in their general character no historical critic today will entertain any serious doubt. The very fact that no claim to miracle working was ever raised on behalf of John is proof that the faith wonders did begin with the ministry of Jesus, doubtless in the characteristic way described in Mk 1:23–38. But we have only to trace back the use made of their testimony from Mk 1:39–3:6 to the S^q discourse on which Mk rests, and from the S appeal back to the actual words of Jesus, to see that to him their witness is not an endowment with personal superiority as against the scribes, not even an individual authority as the one ordained to be the Son of Man, though as yet resident "upon earth." To Jesus the "stretching forth of God's hand to heal" is simply the divine attestation to the message he has been sent to deliver.

The proof that to Jesus it is the message rather than the messenger that has authority appears in many ways, perhaps in none more clearly than in the detachment of the claim from his own person.

Not merely does he distinguish sharply between utterances directed against himself personally and utterances against the work of God, whose "finger" or "Spirit" attends his message, but he associates his own prophetic commission with John's (Mt 21:23–32), and even transmits it to those who after him are to take up the message in their turn. His disciples, both as his aides in Galilee and later when he too, like John, will have sealed the message with his blood, are to preach the coming Kingdom, heal the sick, *proclaiming the forgiveness of their sins*, and are to be received, like himself, as "messengers" of the Highest. When they stand before magistrates and kings the word that they speak will have the inspiration of the same Spirit of the Father, for the Spirit by which the prophets of old bore their witness will be their Advocate (Mt 10:17–33). Whatever developments may have come after Galilean times in the growing belief of the Church in its exalted Lord, who had "received from the Father" the gift now poured forth upon them, there is nothing exclusive in these claims of Jesus. His is as yet the *prophetic*, not the messianic, consciousness. But, as Windisch points out, this final step is a short one.

The relation cannot be inverted. To imagine the Synoptic representations of Jesus' sense of prophetic authority as due to an endeavor of the early Church to find in him something corresponding to its own *charismata* is to transpose cause and effect. It is true that *assimilation* has taken place to some extent. The story of the Baptism and Vocation of Jesus rests upon the Isaian passage quoted in Mt 12:18–21 and reproduces the type of experience belonging to Christian baptism generally as an Adoption by the Spirit and endowment with the "gifts." Lk especially delights in depicting Jesus as the messianic prophet endowed with the Spirit (Lk 4:1, 14–18). His birth was of the Spirit (1:35). "In the Spirit" he utters the Thanksgiving for the Revelation (the gift of *gnosis*) in connection with the endowment of the disciples with authority and Jesus' congratulation of them at beholding the signs of the coming kingdom (Lk 10:17–24). "The Holy Spirit" is the gift of the heavenly Father to them that ask Him (Lk 11:13; *cf.* Mt "good things"). We must allow for a certain amount of coloration of more primitive expressions such as "finger of God" and "hand of God" by the substitution of the term "Spirit," a term more intelligible to later times. But it is not the term which counts but the experience. And the experience in which the later belief of the Church is firmly rooted is that of the historical Jesus, who finds not only assurance for himself but comfort for his imprisoned predecessor and encouragement for disciples who must take up the message after him, in the fact that God had "anointed him with the Holy Ghost and with power, so that he went about doing

good, healing all those that were under the tyranny of the devil, because *God was with him.*"

The historic record of Jesus' claim to speak and act by "the Spirit" must be sought more in the fact than in the terminology. And from this recognition we should approach the interpretation of the two expressions with which our study of Jesus and the Spirit began, the comparison of Jesus' work with the "wisdom of Solomon" and the Thanksgiving for the Revelation. Windisch has admirably accounted for the meagerness of direct and explicit reference in the reported words of Jesus to "the Spirit" as the source of his words and deeds of authority. Later conceptions of Jesus as the Servant, the Son of God, the Son of Man, have tended to eclipse expressions which did not necessarily differentiate him from the earlier prophets or from John. The apostolic age preferred to think of Jesus as giver rather than as receiver of the Spirit. But if we simply ask ourselves what devout Jews of this period meant when they spoke of the "hand" or "finger" or "arm" of God, whether they had any other way of conceiving divine action in the world than through His Spirit, which throughout their Scriptures is the regular agency by which God operates in the world, either to inspire a message or accomplish the work of any human agent, we shall realize the utter impossibility of Jesus, or his followers, resorting to any other explanation of the word of wisdom and the word of power that were his, than "The Spirit of God."

The defense of Jesus against those who impugned and blasphemed his work forms the basis of the Book of Mt on the Hiding of the Mystery; and this defense hinges upon the distinction between the work and the agent, the divine power and wisdom and the human messenger. Many are "stumbled" in the Christ because they cannot make the distinction. Many oppose his work and ascribe his healings to Beelzebub. Their blasphemy is not a matter of concern for him. It matters deeply to them, because the work is God's work, performed in the name of God and by God's beneficent power. Many are deaf to his message as well as blind to the signs of the times. They reject his warning as they had rejected John's. They call for a sign from heaven when the very heavens themselves are ringing with Jonah's cry, "Yet forty days and Nineveh shall be destroyed." Nevertheless Wisdom has her children, there are babes to whom God has revealed things hidden from the wise and understanding. To these "little ones" Jesus appeals. There are disciples whom he can congratulate on witnessing a redemptive work of God which prophets and kings had longed for and died without beholding. To them he can say, "Blessed are your eyes for they see, and your ears for they hear." There are multitudes of penitent believers from the "people of the

soil," spiritual kindred of his own who "have ears to hear." To these he turns for that good and honest soil in which the seed of the word must be sown, assured that in spite of all discouragements it will bear at harvest, "thirty- sixty- a hundred-fold."

When we turn back to the words of Jesus himself, articulated according to their intrinsic meaning and connection, dissociated from the temporary applications put upon them by primitive apologetic, we cannot find terms less severe than "mistranslation" for the rendering which transforms Jesus' reference to his work as "a greater *matter*" than the marvel which drew the Queen of the South to the feet of Solomon, into a claim to be himself a "greater *one*" than the scriptural representative of wisdom. The adjective "greater" is in the neuter. It is not the μείζων (masc.) which Jesus uses when comparing John with the lesser prophets who had gone before, the expression we should expect were Jesus instituting a similar comparison between himself and Solomon. It is πλεῖον, of whose application in the sense of a greater *one* not a single example can be quoted in all Greek literature. Only through ignorance or disregard of the rabbinic abbreviation of style can we explain the persistence of scholars in clinging to so ungrammatical a rendering in spite of the alternative offered by the Revisers in the margin. The Repentance evoked by the preaching of John (or, as some prefer, the preaching of Jesus) was "a greater matter (πλεῖον) than Jonah" in the condensed language of talmudic expression; the phenomena attendant upon Jesus' glad tidings to the poor were "a greater *matter* than Solomon," the report of whose wisdom reached the Queen of the South. It is only a confirmation of this correct rendering of the adjective πλεῖον in Mt 12:41 and 42 that in 12:6 R^{mt} has attempted a compromise, blending the μείζων of 11:11 with the πλεῖον of 12:41 f. in the *neuter* μεῖζον. Even this must still be rendered "a greater *matter*," taking the sense to be "the vindication of my disciples in their freer practice is a matter of more importance than the exemption of the priests in the temple." Thus only violence to the grammar itself avails to obscure the distinction which is made by Jesus between the paramount claim which he makes for the work or the message, and the minimal claim which (at least in his own case) he makes for the messenger and agent.

Equally disturbing to any true appreciation of Jesus' claim to speak with the authority of the prophet is the misinterpretation of the Thanksgiving for the Revelation to Babes. It is commonly spoken of among critics as the "Johannine passage," because it stands alone in Synoptic literature in the degree to which it approximates the fourth evangelist's representation of Jesus as the incarnation of the divine Logos, the Messenger who brings all truth from heaven. The designation "Johannine" is justified inasmuch as here (whether because S is

resting upon some lost Wisdom lyric, as is avowedly the case in Lk 11:49 f., or only because S and Jn fall back here in common with Paul in I Cor. 1:18 ff. upon the *ideas* of the wisdom writers) we do reach back to something like a common root. But to speak of the Q logion as in any sense a personal claim on Jesus' part rather than a claim for his prophetic message, is surely misinterpretation if attention be paid to the distinction which we have shown to be fundamental to his teaching.

Either by appropriate quotation from the wisdom lyrics which bless God for having made choice of Israel to be hierophant to the world of his redemptive purpose, an adoption ignored by Gentile pride but ingrained in the deepest consciousness of the chosen people; or else by imitation of these high claims of Israel to be a priest-nation, bringing true religion to the world and justifying many by his knowledge, the precanonical evangelist of Mt 11:25–27 = Lk 10:21 f. presents Jesus as the representative of this calling of the Servant. Israel has been false to the trust, therefore it has been taken from her, but a remnant of the penitent and lowly have been found to receive the charge. In their behalf Jesus "rejoiced in the Holy Spirit," giving thanks to God in this Hymn

> I thank Thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth,
> That though thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding,
> Thou didst reveal them to the lowly.
> Yea, Father, for such was Thy divine decree.
>
> All revelation was committed to me by my Father,
> And none acknowledges the Son but the Father;
> Nor does any know the Father except the Son,
> And he to whom the Son may choose to bring the revelation.

It is this consciousness of divine revelation in the prophetic message of Jesus upon which Paul falls back, when he speaks of "the revelation of the mystery hidden from the foundation of the world, but now made known in the Scriptures of the prophets," no less than in the interpretation which the Scriptures now receive at the hand of Christian prophets speaking "in the Spirit" (Rom. 16:25 f.). It is this doctrine of the Hiding of the Mystery of the Kingdom of God from scribes and Pharisees that it might be revealed to the "little ones" of Jesus' spiritual Kin, on which Mt has built up his third Book against the Jews.

THEME IV

THE PROBLEM OF CHURCH UNITY

Mt's fourth Discourse is evidently intended primarily for those described in I Cor. 12:28 as having the *charisma* of "governments," who under various designations ("ye that are spiritual," Gal. 6:1; "those that are over you in the Lord," I Thess. 5:12 f.; "those that have the rule over you," Hbr. 13:7, 17, 24) usually receive a special message at the end of the epistles, particularly charging them to compose disputes, sustain the weak, restore the erring members of the flock, and above all to show the spirit of humility and serviceableness characteristic of Jesus. How difficult a task was theirs, how complicated by differences of conscience, particularly in respect to Jewish distinctions of "clean" meats and "holy" days, we may learn from the extended instructions devoted to these questions in Paul's Epistles, that to the Romans in chh. 12–15:14 supplying a typical example.

Because of this unmistakable interest dominating the whole structure of Division B (Mt 18) we naturally expect from previous experience of our evangelist's use of his material that Division A will lead up to this Discourse on church government with narrative selections of corresponding character. In reality such is the case, though the large extent of Markan narrative, covering the interval between the Mission Charge of Mk 6:6–13 (expanded to form Mt's second Discourse in ch. 10) and the Markan discourse on Church Government (Mk 9:30–50) tends to obscure this adaptation.

An exaggerated disposition exists to look upon Mk's groupings as representing real historical sequence, in disregard of the warnings of very ancient tradition. To make apparent their pragmatic nature in face of this predisposal it will be necessary to bear in mind the analysis of the Exile Section of Mk (Mk 6:56–8:26) as expanded and developed by Mt, an analysis to which our special Introduction to Book IV was devoted. If this analysis of the structure of Mk 6:56–8:26 be not wholly misleading our Roman evangelist has used certain duplicate material to supplement his story of the Galilean ministry, constructing from it, in combination with the single anecdote of the Syrophoenician Woman, a complete Ministry of Jesus among the Gentiles. This is brought in after the account of Jesus' withdrawal from Galilee to fill the gap between the withdrawal and the beginning of the *Via Crucis* in 8:27.

The pragmatic value to the western church of material tending to show that Jesus abolished the Jewish distinctions of meats and himself set the example of carrying the gospel to the Gentiles is obvious. We note, however, an extreme paucity of material outside the single story of the Syrophoenician Woman. We also note a straining of sense both as respects this anecdote and the logia which Mk associates with it. Indeed Mk's resort to this in order to obtain the desired application is indicative of failure. No real Gentile mission could be discovered in this obscure period of Jesus' career. Explicit statements of Paul that Jesus did *not* set aside the Mosaic distinctions, but became subject to the Law as an example of consideration for the limitations of those to whom he was sent, and in particular that he "was made a minister of the circumcision to meet the promises made to the fathers" make it certain that there was none. Mk, it would seem, has strained the facts concerning both the incident of the Syrophoenician and the retirement of Jesus to "the borders of Tyre and Sidon." Mt, therefore, is certainly correct in removing all traces of such a tour of Gentile territory as Mk narrates in 7:24–8:26. On the other hand we have no need to question Jesus' withdrawal from the threat of Herod's awakened attention to the obscurity of northern Galilee (the "borders of Tyre and Sidon") and a safe refuge in Philip's kingdom between Caesarea Philippi and Bethsaida.

The treatment given by Lk to this Exile Section of Mk is most significant. With the exception of the first Miracle of the Loaves (really the climax and end of the ministry in Galilee) Lk leaves nothing of Mk's whole construction down to the incident of Caesarea Philippi! This extraordinary cancellation of 75 verses from the very center of Mk's Gospel, covering just that portion which might be expected to prove peculiarly welcome to Gentile readers, is so inexplicable from mere surface indications that the resort of many critics to a theory of accident [1] is not surprising. In spite of the certainty that the copy of Mk employed by Mt (probably later than Lk) contained this section, it was conjectured that Lk's did not contain it, and that in spite of Lk's greater care in supplying himself with documentary evidence (Lk 1:1–4) he neglected to obtain an unmutilated copy of this chief document of all.

This theory of accidental omission by Lk of the Exile Section is made practically untenable by a number of slight indications that he knows something of its contents. We note for example the mention of "Bethsaida" as scene of the Miracle of the Loaves in Lk 9:10 (*cf.* Mk 6:45 and note the omission of Mt). Hence other attempts are made to account for Lk's omission as deliberate. But for the

[1] If accident can be called a theory. Appeal to "accident" is rather the critic's surrender of the attempt to explain.

deliberate omission of so large a section better explanation must be found than the desire to avoid duplication. It is true enough that the material of the Exile Section is largely duplicate, for reasons above stated. It is also true that Lk sometimes goes to an extreme in the cancellation of Markan material, omitting at least in one case, that of the Anointing in Bethany (Mk 14:3–9; *cf.* Lk 7:36–50), what was only in appearance duplicate. But mere recognition that certain parts of this long section of Mk reproduce in variant form matter elsewhere covered cannot account for Lk's omission of the entire mass. He would, as in other cases, have omitted what he felt he had related elsewhere and would have availed himself of the remainder. To the mind of the present writer, only one explanation is adequate to cover all the facts. It is the much fuller and far more historical account which Lk gives in his second treatise, our Book of Acts, of this whole matter of the abolition of the distinctions of meats and carrying of the gospel to the Gentiles. This is, in fact, the main subject of the entire Book of Acts. Naturally evangelists such as the author of our present Mk, limited to the earthly career of Jesus, and Mt, similarly limited, if they sought in the example of Jesus any principles at all which could be applied to this supreme problem of church unity in the apostolic age, were obliged to pursue the method of Mk. We have seen that Mt takes over Mk's Exile Section with careful correction of its more glaring defects.

There are, therefore, two reasons why in Division A we should expect no such rearrangement of Markan material as Mt has heretofore indulged in. (1) The material was already grouped with the same pragmatic purpose as that to which Mt aimed to apply it; [2] (2) there was no outside parallel to affect the order, Mk having already exhausted the available material. As we have seen, Mk's extreme meagerness of data for his Exile Section indicates that little could be related beyond the single anecdote of the Syrophoenician whose scene was "the borders of Tyre and Sidon."

[2] To the above statement we note one important exception. Mk's story of Jesus' rejection at Nazareth (Mk 6:1–6) is attached by Mk at the end of his series of Faith-wonders to emphasize by contrast the lesson of faith. This is contrary to its intrinsic purpose and to the requirement of the context as well; for the paragraph flagrantly interrupts the connection of the Faith-wonders (Mk 4:35–5:43) with Herod's Comment (6:14–16). Because of its Markan connection with the latter Mt prefixes the Nazareth episode to Division A of Book IV; whereas he should have included it among the anecdotes illustrating how Jesus' hearers were "stumbled" at his "wisdom" and his "mighty works." This is obviously its intrinsic application. Mt should have placed it somewhere in the group 12:22–45. The slight postponement to 13:54–58 may be due to oversight in the make-up of Book III, Division A, compensated by later inclusion; or it may be through unwillingness to engage in further transposition of Mk's order.

On the other hand Mt's corrections and additions bear significant witness to his appreciation of Mk's pragmatic aim and full sympathy with it. We need mention here only the "Petrine Supplements" and the reconstruction of the opening scene of Jesus' conflict with the "Pharisees and scribes from Jerusalem" on the issue of the Mosaic distinctions of "clean" and "unclean" (Mt 15:1–20=Mk 7:1–23).

For the grouping and contents of Division A we have, accordingly, a sufficient explanation, an explanation which so fully applies to the corresponding division of Book V that the two may to some extent be considered together. From the close of the Galilean ministry to the end of his story Mt finds no further occasion for material change in Mk's order. He transcribes his chief narrative source in its original order and almost without omission. His only thought is to supplement, and that much less copiously than before. The reason is that no outside data were available; and the reason for this in turn is that Mk's Exile Section had exhausted the little which tradition could furnish to his purpose, while his Peraean Journey section (Mk 10) was equally sterile of real historical event, the anecdotes being both scanty in number and assembled for topical and pragmatic interest rather than historical. Such few data as appear give no warrant for speaking either of a Gentile, or a Perean "ministry" in S. The critical historian will hardly venture further than to say that after Jesus' withdrawal from Galilee a period of obscurity follows until at Jericho we find him at the center of a Galilean group of pilgrims to the Passover. Even the fourth Gospel can teach us at least the lesson of not overrating in historic or chronological value the pragmatic groupings of Mk.

i

By including both the first and the second Miracle of the Loaves, together with their adjoining Markan context, in his narrative introduction to the Discourse on Church Unity Mt supplies his readers with a comprehensive view of the whole subject. The eucharistic features of the story show plainly enough that to the primitive Church the Miracle of the Loaves was significant of its communion with the risen Lord. In orderly groups like those of church and synagogue assembly, attended by the Twelve while Jesus presides, the multitude exemplify the original brotherhood. They prefigure a primitive church assembly under direction of bishop and deacons. Mk's employment of the parallel in a setting significant of an extension of the faith to others beyond the original Galilean group gives concrete form to his teachings in the context of Jesus' abolition of the Mosaic distinctions between "clean" and "unclean" and acceptance

of the Syrophoenician's faith as a "cleansing of the heart." If we may see in the use of the number twelve in the first instance and seven in the second a reflection of conditions in the primitive apostolic community when the separation was first made between "Hebrews" and "Hellenists" by appointment of seven deacons from the latter to "serve tables" over against the Twelve who had thus officiated before,[3] Mk's intention thus to symbolize the two great branches of the Church will be the more evident.

Mt, as we have seen, follows suit in this grouping but adds touches of his own which show his appreciation and approval of Mk's general application, though they correct and extend it in certain particulars. Especially do the "Petrine supplements" in 14:28–32, 16:17–19 and 17:24–27 show how much greater importance Mt attaches in the solution of the great issue to the authority of Peter. This apostle, to whose vision of the risen Christ the Church owed its first confession of Jesus as "the Son of God" (14:28–33), and whom many regarded as specially chosen to be an apostle to the Gentiles (Acts 15:7), is he to whom Jesus expounds the true significance of his debated utterance (15:15). Peter further receives full authority as head and "Rock-foundation of the Church" to "bind and loose" (16:17–19). He also acts as Christ's vicegerent and steward of the brotherhood in its financial relation to the state (17:24–27). Mt thus goes even further than Lk in his departure from Mk's ascription to Jesus alone of the authoritative cancellation of the Mosaic distinctions. It is true that on both sides there are traces of difference. Lk himself shows considerable inconsistency in ascribing the decision first to a church conclave in Jerusalem which endorses Peter's action in disregarding the distinctions after the conversion of Cornelius (Acts 10:1–11:18), while thereafter, at a second church council held again in Jerusalem after the conversions effected by Paul and Barnabas, he repeats the abolition, subject to reservations proposed by James (Acts 15:1–33). Mt leaves no place for James, but shows similar difference as respects Peter's *personal* authority to "bind and loose" over against *church* authority in the contrast between 16:19 and 18:18. Both Lk and Mt, however, as compared with Mk, show the effects of authentic tradition in assigning to Peter a momentous part in the decision.

It is quite in keeping with a just historical sense of values that Lk should make the story of the Church's triumph over the Mosaic restrictions of "clean" and "unclean" the central feature of his account of how the gospel was extended to the Gentiles. The doctrine that God might cleanse the hearts of the heathen by faith, so that circumcision and the ritual observances became needless for their salvation, was easily framed. The Pharisees had as yet achieved but

[3] See *BGS*, pp. 81 and 96.

slight success in convincing the Galilean peasantry that the distinctions of meats had any application to their case. Josephus' story of the conversion of Izates of Adiabene shows that on the mission field itself Jews were far from agreement in calling for observance of the ritual law among converts. Our evangelists are certainly correct in their unanimous representation that Jesus and his following of *aposynagogoi* (unchurched) paid small attention to it. Difficulties arose only when Jews previously "clean" according to Pharisaic standards became "unclean" by "going in to men uncircumcised and eating with them," or when Jews dwelling "among the Gentiles" ceased to circumcise their children and obey the (Mosaic) customs. The real problem was how the ritually "clean" man was to be protected from "pollution" by contact with the ritually "unclean." The Talmud furnishes a strict parallel in its provisions against defilement by contact with non-observers. In Acts the non-observers are of course the Gentile converts. In Mt and Mk, as in the Talmud, the non-observers are the Galilean "people of the soil." [4]

Dissemination of the gospel in Gentile territory would inevitably entail loss of caste by individual Jewish believers, if they "ate with men uncircumcised"; and if the example of disregard were set by men of sufficient rank among the apostles it would surely lead to complete abandonment of the distinctions of meats outside of Palestine itself. This effect upon Christianized *Jews*, not any mere question of the salvability of converted *Gentiles* without the Mosaic observances, was the issue at stake; and to those of Jerusalem, whose leader was James, and who thought of the coming kingdom as a restoration of the ruined tabernacle of David to which "the residue of mankind" would resort as center of their allegiance (Acts 15:15–18), the issue was vital.

It was also vital to "certain of the sect of the Pharisees who believed," who insisted that even the Gentile converts of Paul and Barnabas must be circumcised and charged to keep the law of Moses (Acts 15:5). Lk tells of the compromise adopted on proposal of James by "the apostles and elders" at Jerusalem, which would make it possible for Jewish observers to circulate or dwell among Gentile non-observers without loss of caste. In spite of our positive knowledge from Paul's Epistles that such was not the case, Acts insists that Paul also not only undertook to circulate these compromise "decrees" in Galatia, where lay the chief seat of trouble (Acts 16:4), but that Paul himself set an example to "the Jews which are among the Gentiles" of "walking orderly, keeping the law" and instructing them to do the same (Acts 21:20–26).

The testimony of Paul and the later literature is decisive that this

[4] See Büchler, *Der Galiläische Am ha-Aretz.*

compromise of the Jerusalem "decrees" was futile. As between Jerusalem and a part of the church at Antioch, those who sided with Barnabas and Peter against Paul, including "all the Jews," the decrees served their purpose for a time and for a limited territory. With the aid of Silas Paul resumed, after the rupture with Barnabas and Antioch, his missionary efforts on the old basis. The Judaizers contested his control of Galatia, and even of Achaia, but this opposition soon yielded to the rapid passage of the center of gravity of the Church to the Greek-speaking branch. Lk's standpoint therefore represents a temporary halt, a brief respite in the inevitable trend away from Pharisaic Judaism obtained through the desperate exertion by Jerusalem of all its powers of conservatism.

Mt, on the other hand, and the Petrine element of Acts, whose story culminates in the account of the decision of the issue by the conclave assembled in Jerusalem after the conversion of Cornelius (Acts 10:1–11:18), represents a broader view, whether the documents in the case be earlier or later. These two authorities, Mt and I Acts, represent the situation as it was before the delegation "from James" came to remonstrate with Peter at Antioch, and as it came to be after the interlude produced by the futile "decrees." The compiler of Acts *as it stands* represents the short-lived triumph of "those from James." In Acts 10:1 ff. and Mt 15:1 ff. alike the distinctions of meats are destitute of any divine sanction, a mere "tradition of the elders" which the scribes and their blind followers the Pharisees seek to force upon the people, a "planting which the Heavenly Father did not plant" and which is now to be "rooted up." It belongs to "the teaching of the Pharisees and Sadducees," a leaven of which the Church must beware (Mt 15:13; 16:12). On this issue Mt is less compromising than Lk. If he shows the consideration for the scrupulous which Paul demands as an imitation of Christ, it is not in the way that Lk would show it, by the enactment of legislation in their favor. Mt as well as Lk ignores the lapse of Peter at Antioch so sharply reprimanded by Paul. (Where else than in Paul's flaming apologetic could we expect to find reference to it?) The difference is that while Mt stands by Peter's original position of freedom and exalts his authority to "bind and loose" as though nothing had happened to undermine it, Lk deserts his first loyalty to Peter in the settlement of Acts 10:1–11:18 to take up with the ill-advised compromise proposed by James in Acts 15:1–33.

ii

Mk's original undertaking to arrange all his material in the form of a consecutive story of Jesus' public career compelled him to limit himself in the treatment of the subject of the breaking down of the

"middle wall of partition" to slight adaptations of the anecdotes he groups together and the selection of such as seemed to him best suited to his purpose. It entailed the inclusion of large portions whose primary function is only historical, narratives such as that of Peter's Confession at Caesarea Philippi, combined with the Transfiguration story and its symbolic sequel,[5] which simply advance the drama. Of course Mt, in adopting Mk's historical outline, is forced to include these also. Their presence in Division A does not neutralize the evidence of the additions and changes which indicate his dominant motive. They play the same part as the narrative sections of the Pentateuch taken over by P from JE to form the framework for the code-discourses.

In *BGS* the reader will find our judgment as to the part these anecdotes were intended by Mk to play in the development of his story. It is apparent, however, that Mk reaches the end of a chapter with 9:29, and that the Quarrel for Pre-eminence (Mk 9:33–37 = Mt 18:1–5), leading to a discourse on Toleration (verses 38–41), Stumbling-blocks (verses 42–48 = Mt 18:6–9), and Peaceable Control (verses 49 f. = Mt 5:13), form the basis for Mt's fourth Discourse. To the elaboration of this Markan basis in Mt 18 we must now give our attention for the sake of the light it has to throw on the authentic teaching of Jesus. For, as already noted, the process by which our evangelists turn to account the sayings and doings of Jesus applicable to this issue is but a continuation of the practice of Paul. Especially in the matter of consideration for the scruples of "weak" consciences is the example of Jesus appealed to. We naturally expect to find grouped together in Mt's fourth Discourse such teachings of Jesus as the apostolic Church found applicable in the course of its great struggle to "keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."

At the outset of the Discourse Mt finds it impossible to take the broad view of Mk in the matter of Toleration. The incident of Mk 9:38–41 deals with a situation almost identical with that of Acts 19:13–16. A stranger exorcist practices his healing art in the name of Jesus. Lk meets the case by leaving the alien exorcist to discomfiture at the hands of his own patients. At Ephesus such a situation had developed; the sons of Sceva, a Jew belonging to a high priestly family, had thus rivalled the work of Paul. But the outcome had only enhanced the reputation of Paul while discomfiting the sons of Sceva. Mk is even more conciliatory than Lk. He takes the same attitude as Paul in Phil 1:15–18, who rejoices that by such rivalry "whether in pretense or truth Christ is preached." But Mt cannot bring himself to such a pitch of toleration. The worker of miracles, even if he profess the name of Christ and call him Lord, Lord, must be tried by the test

[5] For the pragmatic aim of Mk 9:14–29 see *BGS ad loc.*

of "good" works. Mere wonder-working does not prove him a friend. Unless he bring forth the fruit of good works he is of those false prophets of whom the Church has specially to beware (24:11 f., 24). At the judgment there will be many to say, Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy by thy name, and exorcise by thy name, and by thy name do many mighty works? But the Judge will answer: I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work lawlessness (Mt 7:15–23). The instance of Toleration cited by Mk comes too near to Mt's special abhorrence, the "false prophet" who teaches "lawlessness." He omits Mk 9:38–40 and reverses the logion with which it ends. In Mt 12:30 = Lk 11:23 the saying of Mk 9:40 "Whoever is not against us is for us" becomes "Whosoever is not with me is against me, and whosoever gathereth not with me scattereth."

On the other hand Mt enlarges in verses 6–14 on the theme of Stumbling (Mk 9:42). He recognizes in the Markan verse a logion of S also given in Lk 17:1 f. in fuller form and continues the Q context in verses 15 and 21 f. (= Lk 17:3 f.). Following his regular method Mt intertwines now his Markan and non-Markan material, taking verses 8 f. from Mk, though their connection is only verbal, and adding in verses 12–14 the appropriate parable of the Lost Sheep (Lk 15: 3–7). The intervening verse 10 (P) may be derived from oral tradition, and the closing verse (14) is editorial; but in spite of the somewhat heterogeneous make-up, whose most incongruous element, verses 8 f., owe their inclusion to Mk, the agglutination is well adapted to Mt's purpose. It reflects the spirit as well as the style of Jesus in its hot indignation against those who take advantage of the weak and friendless (the "little ones" of verse 10); for we have not only the parallel in Lk 17:1 ff. to prove the authenticity of the utterance but also Paul's repeated appeals to the example of Jesus in his entreaties that no "stumbling-block" or "occasion of falling" be placed before the feet of the "weak brother."

Mt can well afford to spare the curious logion "Everyone shall be salted with fire" (Mk 9:49) and the editorial close of the Markan discourse (9:50b) for the sake of this characteristic saying on the guardian angels of the defenseless, misunderstood though it commonly is. Its connection with verses 6–9 is so admirable as to make its derivation from S highly probable, since we can account for omission by Lk as due to Gentile unfamiliarity with the Jewish doctrine of angelic "advocates" at the divine court of justice. The "little ones" of the saying, as explained above, are the poor, the weak, the friendless. Clement of Rome in quoting the logion renders it fairly "one of my elect." Just as Jesus undertakes to be himself Advocate in heaven for those who confess him upon earth (Mt 10:32 f. = Lk 12:8 f.) so it is assumed in contemporary Jewish belief that in the heavenly court

of justice the Judge of all the earth, whose special attribute it is to befriend the widow, the orphan and the oppressed, grants readier access into his presence ("seeing the face of God") to those "guardian" angels who seek redress for the wrongs of the poor. It is a pity that the obscurity of the allusions to current belief should lead to the omission of so typical a logion of Jesus in ancient times, or to its misunderstanding today.

The group Mt 18:6 f., 10, led over in S (as it does in Mt save for the inclusion from Mk of verses 8 f., the spurious verse 11 and the supplement of the parable of the Lost Sheep) to the sayings on Restoration of the erring, and Forgiveness of Brethren (Mt 18:15–21 = Lk 17:3 f.). Here Mt expands by inserting in verses 16–20 certain principles of church procedure highly Jewish both in form and substance, while *Ev. Naz.* appends the comment that sin was found in the prophets themselves after their anointing with the Spirit (*cf.* Is. 6:5–7). This binding together of church rules with authentic sayings of Jesus exemplifies the process we are seeking to elucidate, a process of practical application as indispensable today as in the times of Paul or Mt. Once more, as in 15:15, Mt introduces "Peter" as interlocutor for obtaining the expression of Jesus' mind.

The utterance employs the hyperbolic, paradoxical form so characteristic of Jesus' utterances against Pharisaic legalism (*cf.* 5:23 f., 39 f.; 7:3–5; 23:24). As against the legalist's limitation of retaliation Jesus had called for an application of divine redemptive love as free of limit as God's own (5:39 f.); here, as against the mere inculcation of a large measure of forgiveness he demands that the spirit of forgiveness shall have no limit.

The interjected rules of church procedure (verses 16–20) build upon the wider principle laid down in the logion "Rebuke a brother, but if he change his mind forgive him" (verse 16 = Lk 17:3). Mt proceeds to legislate for the case where the brother is not "restored." First, the scriptural requirement as to witnesses must be met (verse 16; *cf.* Dt. 19:15). The last resort is to "the church." Its unfavorable verdict entails a sentence of exclusion, exactly as in synagogue procedure. Power to "bind and loose" belongs to it (verse 18; *cf.* 16:19). Not only so, but the same exalted claims are made here for church authority as appear in Acts 15:28, where the "decrees" of the apostles and elders assembled "with the whole church" are treated as an utterance of "the Holy Ghost." This is no Christian innovation but a common claim of the Synagogue for its official utterances. The Church's conviction that its united prayer avails with God as well as its formal decision in questions of conduct, and that God's own Spirit, as it had been with Jesus, continues where brethren gather "in his name," only translates into Christian form and carries onward the

reverent sense of divine authority attached by Jewish worshippers to the formal utterances of their tribunals.

Mt closes his Discourse with a typical parable, The Unforgiving Servant (18:23–35). It offers no new teaching, it does no more than expand the principle more concisely expressed in the Lord's Prayer with Mt's comment attached (6:12,14 f.). But it is full of meaning as expressing the deep longing of our evangelist, as well as of the church whose mouthpiece he is, for that Unity of the Spirit which Paul makes the climax of his entreaty for the churches (Gal. 5:15; Phil. 2:1 ff.; Eph. 4:1–16). True, the procedure is fitted to the need of the individual local church, but behind it lies the aspiration which the Ephesian evangelist places on the lips of Jesus as his supreme "highpriestly" prayer (Jn 17:20 f.).

The form given by Mt to his appeal for unity in the brotherhood is indeed widely different from Paul's or Jn's. It is characteristic of him that he should use as the means for attaining his high purpose the threat of everlasting torment for refusal to display the forgiving spirit. But this is not all that the Discourse contains. We should remember the service Mt renders in bringing together both doings and sayings of Jesus applicable to this vital problem. His fourth Book places in the hands of those who "had the rule" over the churches the wisdom of Jesus bearing upon the healing of strife. In both Divisions, narrative Introduction and closing Discourse, Mt has faced the crucial problem of Church Unity and sincerely sought to apply to it the principles of the gospel. It will be worth while before closing our discussion of the theme to recreate in imagination the perilous conditions confronting the Church at the close of the first century, and observe once more how Mt has turned to account in meeting them what still remained of Jesus' recorded utterance.

To Paul's mind the supreme peril of the Church was the danger of disruption inseparable from the transition from a Jewish to a Hellenistic basis. His great battle for the freedom wherewith Christ had liberated mankind from the yoke of legalism was but the opening conflict. The prolonged struggle which followed was a war to end war. It cost Paul all his free remaining years of missionary effort and culminated in his great peace-delegation to Jerusalem, which bore as its olive branch the offering of all his Greek-speaking churches. But beyond and above this it cost also Paul's liberty and ultimately his life. The prayer in which he begs the Christians at Rome to join him, that his "offering" may be accepted, outlining his proposed journey and its purpose (Rom. 15:14–33), should serve to some extent to offset the uncomprehending story of Acts, which tells of Paul's determination to carry through this journey in the face of repeated warnings of the Spirit that "bonds and imprisonment" await him, but in its

idealizing assumption of complete agreement among the apostles from the start leaves us quite in the dark as to why the issue was so momentous. But Paul, at least, was under no illusions as to the disastrous consequences that must follow if his peacemaking journey did not succeed. Disruption as between Jewish and Gentile Christianity must in the end prove fatal to both. Paul could see this as a Christian statesman. In the spirit of Christian martyrdom he was ready "not to be bound only, but also to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus." The sacrifice was made for the Unity of the Church.

The point of collision over which disruption seemed likeliest to occur was that already described of Jewish "purity," the question of "clean" and "common," or "unclean." Here Paul's insistence on freedom from the caste system of Mosaism for his Gentile converts, and his practice of disregarding when among them the Jewish ablutions and distinctions of meats and sacred days, was interpreted as antinomian iconoclasm. In Jerusalem Paul was commonly reported as "teaching the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, telling them not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs." After reading in Gal. 2:11 f. Paul's open demand at Antioch that Peter continue the practice he had at first adopted in imitation of Paul of disregarding these distinctions it is not easy to deny a certain element of truth in the charge.

As we have seen, the compromise measure proposed by James, which Lk puts forward as apostolic and inspired, proved futile. In the nature of the case the breakdown was inevitable. Nothing could possibly meet the situation of growing disparity between the Jewish and Gentile branches of the Church save frank recognition of the principle Peter himself is made to enunciate in Acts 15:7 that God had recognized no distinction between Gentile and Jew, "cleansing by faith the heart" of those who had been strangers to the Mosaic distinctions. True, Paul did his utmost to enable the scrupulous Jew to avoid unnecessary "defilement" by invoking the principle inculcated by Jesus to avoid "stumbling the weak." He did not fail to urge the "strong" to follow his example, just as he was following Christ's, in becoming "as if under the law," when among circumcised converts. But in cases like that of Peter at Antioch, when Peter "played the hypocrite" along with Barnabas and the rest of the Jews under instigation of the delegates from James, it was not possible to silently acquiesce. This was a concerted endeavor to "compel the Gentiles to live as do the Jews." Concession ceased now to be a virtue. It became sheer "hypocrisy." Similarly the Lukan "decrees." Enacted as they were by the Jewish branch of the Church only, and laid down as "necessary" (ἐπαναγκές) to avoid the "pollutions of idols" Paul was forced to resist them as a "yoke of bondage." The

Jerusalem "decrees" did not solve the problem. This appears from Rev. 2:14, 20 and *Did.* vi. 3

A more promising platform of unity is offered in the Gospel of Mk, whose Exile Section is devoted to just this emergency. Mk anticipates Mt in combining three utterances of Jesus which were applicable to the situation: (1) the saying on Inward Purity (Mk 7:15); (2) the incident of the Syrophoenician Woman; (3) a combination of three logia on Toleration, on Stumbling the Weak, and on Peace with one another in 9:33–50.

But Mk speaks for a Roman community. He reflects something indeed of the substance of Rom. 14:1–15:7; but he is far too sweepingly anti-Jewish in his own attitude, and is historically incorrect in his depiction of that of Jesus. Mt follows Mk, but by no means blindly. His corrections are detailed and minute; at the same time his additions show that he appreciates and sympathizes with Mk's main contention. On the main point, the principle that "uncleanness" is moral and not material, inward and not outward, he takes ground just as sweeping as Mk's, and (a matter of striking interest to the historian bent on classification of documents) he is just as sweeping as the Petrine source of Acts 10:1–11:18. Mt bases this fundamental postulate on the broad ground of prophetic principle. Fitness to "see God," that is, to have access to the divine presence or "dwelling," is not a matter of ceremonial ablutions or externalities of ritual, but of inward or "heart" purity (Mt 5:8; *cf.* Ps. 24:3–6). Moreover Mt explicitly claims the authority of "Peter" for this application of the saying of Jesus concerning inward vs. outward "cleanness."

However, Mt does not go to the length of Mk in attributing the system of ablutions to "all the Jews," nor in maintaining that Jesus by his utterance had "made all meats clean." On the contrary he correctly describes the system of ablutions as a "tradition of the elders"; and if by inserting his allusion to the "hedge of the Law" (verses 12–14) *after* the saying on Inward Purity he seems to imply that the distinctions of meats were also a Pharisaic innovation, the implication is possibly not intended.

Even if in verses 12–14 Mt does not intend to go the whole length of Mk's contention that Jesus abolished the distinctions of meats, it is certain that he does intend in the next paragraph to bring out the principle of heart-cleansing "by faith." His additions to the story of the Syrophoenician Exorcism are clearly directed to this end. He delays Jesus' consent to the woman's entreaty and magnifies the disciples' opposition, until he has made it unmistakably apparent that "faith" is a sufficient reason for abandoning the Mosaic limitations. In this second respect he endorses and corroborates Mk's employment of an incident which Lk significantly omits. On the other hand

his minute corrections exonerate Jesus from the charge of himself having violated the limits of his mission.

Similar elaboration of the logion "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees," which Mk had already applied to the dulness of the Twelve in failing to take in the significance of the two Miracles of the Loaves (Mt 16:5–12=Mk 14:18–21), shows that Mt applies it to "the teaching of the Pharisees and Sadducees." This expression, substituted for Mk's "Pharisees and Herod," cannot well have any other meaning than a survival among the disciples of their former Jewish prejudices. [6] In the connection it is difficult to close one's eyes to the origin of the great controversy in the apostolic Church among "certain of the sect of the Pharisees who believed" (Acts 15:5); for with these Mt has as little sympathy as the Nazarenes themselves, who heartily endorsed the work of Paul.

Mt is also more correct than Mk in tracing authority for the "loosing" of the Mosaic caste system to Peter rather than directly to Jesus himself. He has indeed no use for the compromise of the Jerusalem Council, and ignores (as we should expect) Peter's unfortunate lapse at Antioch under pressure from James. He does maintain, however, with utmost boldness that Peter was authorized by Jesus himself to take the momentous step. For this reason in Book IV every possible occasion is seized to enhance the authority of Peter, with or without the support of the Church (16:19;18:18), to "loose" as well as "bind." All the larger additions to the transcribed narrative of Mk have in view this object of magnifying Peter's authority. Peter, the foundation Rock of the Church, its chief undershepherd, had been fully authorized to interpret and apply the saying about Inward Cleanness, so that in due time he might break down the "middle wall of partition" and carry the gospel to the Gentiles without the yoke which in Acts 15:10 Peter himself maintains "neither we nor our fathers were able to bear." The Petrine authority championed by Mt is something quite different from that maintained by Rome, and is ever held in check by the rebuke administered by Paul (Gal. 2:11 ff.). It remains nevertheless a factor not to be disregarded in the history of the Church.

But Mt's chief service in this Book for Church Leaders is his fuller application to the problem of Church Unity of those utterances of Jesus which had already been partially applied by Paul and Mk. His Discourse is built upon that of Mk, as usual. In its introductory tale of the Quarrel for Precedence and the added logia about Stumbling the Weak he is in the main simply reproducing Mk (Mt 18:1–9= Mk 9:33–37, 42–48). It is quite probable that in taking over with the rest Mk's purely *ad vocem* attachment of 9:43–48 Mt understands it

[6] See Appended Note IX.

to apply to those against whom Paul repeatedly warns the churches as "causing divisions and stumblings" (σκάνδαλα). The reference in at least the majority of these warnings is to professed imitators of Paul who refused to curb their own liberty in the matter of forbidden meats as Paul did, but made it "a stumbling-block to the weak" (I Cor. 8:9; *cf.* Rom. 14:13–23; 16:17). Mt, if not Mk before him, may mistake the exhortation to pluck out the offending member of the body, that is, to stop at no sacrifice for the kingdom's sake (Mk 9:43–48), as a warning to church leaders to exclude the "roots of bitterness." If so, his inclusion of the logion is fully in harmony with the chief aim of the Discourse, as well as with his own special dread of the teachers of "lawlessness." However this may be, Mt reaches a turning point of his thought thereafter as he attaches further material from his non-Markan sources. The heart of the teaching of Jesus on the issue of Church Unity was embodied in the sayings on Stumbling vs. Saving the Weak.

We need not again point out how the common meeting point of Paul and of this most un-Pauline of our evangelists is in the example, on which both fall back, of the winsomeness, the forbearance, the gentleness of Christ. There is a lesson to be learned by the divided Church of today in the applications made of the word and example of Jesus in the great transition period of Christianity from Jewish to Greek soil and modes of thought. Paul, and Mk and Mt, to say nothing of Lk and Jn, are teachers in their own right of this difficult process of adaptation of the teaching to peculiarly difficult times. But there is no other to equal him to whom all New Testament writers look up, the one Teacher whose simplicity of devotion to the will of his Father in heaven gives a wisdom beyond that of sages, philosophers, or scribes.

THEME V

THE MESSIANIC JUDGMENT

Mt has been justly called "the most apocalyptic of our Gospels." Every one of its five great Discourses concludes with a more or less extended reference to the rewards and penalties of the Day of Judgment. In addition every opportunity afforded by the material is availed of for heightening the colors of the apocalyptic judgment scenes or emphasizing their nearness. Singleness of aim for the Christian is interpreted as concentration to obtain the heavenly reward offered to those alone whose good works bear witness in their behalf. "In that day" Christ as judge of the world will sentence to eternal fire all those who cannot meet this requirement, especially such as have taught "lawlessness," even though they have prophesied, exorcised, and wrought miracles in his name.

And that Day is close at hand. As against the more general warning of Mk 8:38–9:1 Mt 16:27 f. makes the assurance more definite and specific:

> For the Son of Man is about to come in the glory of his Father with his angels, then will he render to every man according to his work. I give you my word, there are some of those that stand here that shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom.

In like manner, as we have seen in the introductory discussions of the Doom-chapter of Mk, Mt changes the emphasis in a way to transform Mk's warning against undue eschatological agitation into an encouragement to look for an "immediate" issue from the suffering the Church has undergone and the "falling away" it is now experiencing in consequence of the work of the "false prophets." Mk aims to repress apocalyptic excitement, after the example of Paul in I Thessalonians, Mt to rekindle its sinking fires.

This is typical both of the Jewish-christian character of the writing and of its relatively late date. The rapid passage of the center of gravity of the Church from the Aramaic-speaking Palestinian branch to the Greek-speaking churches of the Graeco-Roman world had brought about momentous changes in its character and mode of thought. Greek reaction against the traditional eschatology of the Synagogue preached by the apostles is already strongly apparent in I Cor. 15. From Paul's time to Polycarp's the indications are superabundant of Greek reluctance to take over Jewish ideas of the resur-

rection (in the flesh) and (apocalyptic) judgment. Antioch, where Polycarp's older contemporary Ignatius wages intense warfare for these doctrines in their crudest form against docetic heretics, is a hotbed of Jewish-Greek controversy in the Church at the very period when Mt is first coming into circulation. Moreover the complaints of moral relaxation so loudly brought on the Jewish-christian side against brethren of Gentile origin and modes of thought (complaints which must have had some foundation in view of the urgent appeals of Paul to his churches to avoid such "stumbling-blocks" to the Church of God) are quite naturally associated, at least in the minds of contenders for "the faith once for all delivered to the saints," with the rapid waning of the expectation of "judgment to come." The "false teachers," says Polycarp, "pervert the oracles of the Lord to their own lusts, and deny the resurrection and judgment." The Pastoral and the Johannine Epistles show how vivid was the Church's apprehension of this moral relaxation. The Epistles of Jas., Jude, and II Pt show to how large an extent the blame for it was laid, justly or unjustly, at the door of the "vain talkers," the deniers of the historic tradition on the side of its physical reality. It was laid especially to the deniers of the physical resurrection and second Coming of Jesus to judge the world. As we have seen, the appearance of Mt furnished the Church with exactly the weapon it desired to meet these parlous conditions. Mt's disagreements with Mk and Lk were adjusted as rapidly as possible, where Mk and Lk had previously circulated with authority, until the Jewish-christian record became so completely "the" Gospel *par excellence* as to make the acceptance of the fourth Gospel in some quarters difficult or even impossible.

The apocalypticism of Mt marks, therefore, a very definite stage in the process of adjustment of the gospel to its function in the formation of a genuine world-religion. It marks the swing of the pendulum after the death of Paul toward the Jewish branch of the Church, a necessary step for the conserving of its best historic heritage; also a thoroughly eirenic and catholic-minded step, so far at least as the orthodox Greek-speaking churches are concerned, however bitter its denunciations of the teachers of "lawlessness."

But this step was not the last. The final step was taken from the Hellenistic side and was at least equally eirenic and equally conservative of the historic *paratheke*, the "entrusted" gospel. The Fourth Gospel, published, not long after Mt, from Ephesus, at least in its ultimate form, represents this final swing of the pendulum.

Jn undertakes the most difficult of the harmonistic adjustments between Jewish and Greek modes of thought, the eschatological, and undertakes it in a spirit of the most delicate and tactful consideration.

The fourth evangelist alters the whole scheme of Gospel composition shown in the Synoptic treatment of the Doom-chapter, by substituting the mystical discourses of the upper room and the Highpriestly Prayer for the Synoptists' lurid depiction of vengeance on Jerusalem and second coming to Judgment. In Jn apocalypticism is displaced, but tactfully. The Farewell of Jesus (Jn 14) begins with acceptance (for substance) of the doctrine of heavenly "mansions;" "if it were not so I would have told you."[1] But the discourse proceeds to develop a higher sense of the "dwelling together" of the disciple, his Lord and the Father, a mutual indwelling wholly of the order which is spiritual and timeless. Thus the manifestation "not unto the world" (verse 22) comes to take its rightful place alongside of the cruder doctrine it is destined to supersede, and comes without contention in the true spirit of peace. This mystical sense of the divine "indwelling" (*mishkan*) builds on ideals maintained by Paul (II Cor. 6:16) and the seer of Rev. 21:22 f. It has really better foundation in Hebrew prophecy (*e.g.*, Ez. 37:27, Zech. 2:10 f.) than the cosmological speculations of apocalypse.

The real problem of the practical interpreter today is like that of the fourth evangelist, to do full justice to the historic sense of those apocalyptic ideas native to every Jewish mind which Mt so ardently champions, while at the same time elucidating that inner core of individual faith characteristic of Jesus himself, which made practicable the ultimate adjustment to Hellenistic ideas; an adjustment wherein the fourth evangelist takes by far the largest part.

i

The earliest writings of the New Testament, Paul's Thessalonian Epistles, are among the most vivid in their presentation of that Son of Man doctrine which formed the very spear-point of Christian propaganda. The place which the doctrine of Christ's second coming to judgment occupied in the missionary preaching not of Paul only but of all "apostles" may be judged from Lk's sample sermon of Paul at Athens, so strikingly confirmed by Paul's own account of his "entering in" at Thessalonika (I Thess. 1:10). At Athens Paul preached "Jesus and the resurrection." He declared that God had "appointed a day in the which he would judge the world in righteousness by that man whom He hath ordained, whereof He hath given assurance unto all men in that He hath raised him from the dead." Gentiles might scoff at the Jewish form of the belief in divine retribution, but its substance was in accordance with the deep conviction of

[1] *Cf. Eth. Enoch* xlv. 2–5 "My Elect One shall sit on the throne of his glory and make choice among their deeds (*cf.* Mt 25:31–46), *and their mansions will be innumerable.*"

the times. Paul's depiction of the "wrath of God" in Rom. 1:18–2:16, to be "revealed in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men, according to my gospel, by Jesus Christ" has often been compared to contemporary Stoic and Cynic diatribes; it probably stands still closer to the street preaching of Pythagorean and Orphic "salvationists." A Felix might credibly be represented as trembling while Paul reasoned of "righteousness and self-control and the judgment to come," because Paul's words were uttered with an intensity of conviction unrivalled even among the most ardent of Gentile moralists, while on the substance of the matter there was no disagreement. "Be not deceived, God is not mocked; whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap" was axiomatic in all quarters. And in addition men were convinced that the cup of human wickedness was full to overflowing. Judgment must soon come.

It was in the same spirit that John the Baptist had preached in Judea, uttering the classic burden of the prophets, "Wash you, make you clean, put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes." Jesus himself had taken up the cry with added earnestness. The great Day was at hand.

Of the authenticity of Jesus' repeated warnings of the impending Day of Jehovah there can be no more doubt than of his conception of its general nature nor of its imminence. His parables urging to watchfulness have this apocalyptic background. Their point is timeless because the duty urged is readiness to give account to Him that looketh not on the outward man but upon the heart. Yet how unintelligible would they have been to the hearers, as well as uncharacteristic of the human simplicity of the Speaker, had they not sprung from the accepted apocalyptic conviction of the coming to judgment of Jehovah's representative! If we trace a distinction between the individual message of Jesus and the background of convention to which it had to be adjusted to be intelligible, at least let us go back toward it through the known beliefs of the apostolic age which transmits the record. To the Church of the apostolic time the favorite self-designation of Jesus was "the Son of Man"; not so much because he had actually employed it with greater frequency as because he had frequently spoken of the messianic restoration which to them was "the Day (or Coming) of the Son of Man." On at least one occasion Jesus himself had used this term in appealing to the vindication his Father would surely give him, were it only beyond the grave. His words had been reminiscent of Daniel's vision of the bestowal of the enduring kingdom (Mt 16:27 f.; *cf.* Dan. 7:13 f.), and this appeal inevitably conveyed the sense that Jesus himself would play the part of Israel's representative in the Danielic scene, the Son of Man who receives the kingdom at the judgment-seat of the Ancient

of Days. After Calvary to believe in Jesus at all his disciples could only conceive of him as the Son of Man, destined to return "on the clouds of heaven" after having received the kingdom from his Father. We need feel no surprise, then, if to them this "self-designation" soon eclipsed all others in importance, and carried with it many connotations which Jesus himself would have accepted only in a very qualified sense, if at all. The "Son," or as darker days drew on, the "Servant," might well have served more adequately to express the distinctive messianic self-consciousness of Jesus; but to the Church, which carried forward the campaign for repentance in view of the approaching Day, the title most in evidence could only be "the Son of Man."

This title is in itself expressive of the apocalypticism of the primitive Church. True, it is absent from Paul, its place taken by terms more intelligible to Greek ears, such as "the man from heaven" (I Cor. 15:47 f.); but the idea expressed by it is very vividly present, as we have seen. It is used in the fourth Gospel, though in a modified sense. Its common use in all the Gospels, though scarcely ever outside, and almost invariably in utterances placed in Jesus' own mouth, proves that to the apostolic Church it stood in a very special way for the claim made by Jesus himself upon his generation. If he could say to those who had stood by him through the hardships and perils of his vain struggle to win Israel back to her allegiance, alluding to the Psalmist's hope for the renewal of the city of David, "I covenant unto you a kingdom as my Father hath covenanted to me, in the regeneration ye shall sit on thrones judging the tribes of Israel," the messianic kingship to which he believed himself called of God certainly involved a messianic judgment. The "thrones of judgment" which would secure justice for the poor and oppressed among the people (Ps. 72:2–4), "thrones of the house of David," would not be occupied by subordinates while that of the Son of David himself remained empty. Hence some part in this judgment belongs to him also.

Jesus, with all his humility and self-abnegation, felt that he could not be true to the call of God if in face of the cross he turned back from the responsibilities of leadership. Now that all roads seemed closed save that to Calvary, and the issue must be carried to God's own heavenly tribunal, we may be sure he would not hesitate to take upon himself at least the function of the Danielic Son of Man, the representative of Israel who pleads at God's judgment-seat for vindication against her mighty adversaries.

The modern devout mind is reluctant to admit what would at first appear an assumption on Jesus' part of a function belonging only to God. Something of the same reluctance was felt by Gentile converts in the days of the fourth Gospel, if we may draw an inference from the painstaking defense in Jn 5:22–30 of this particular function of

"the Son of Man." The apocalyptic world-assize is logically superseded in Jn 3:17–21. A *second* Coming to judgment can have no further meaning after an automatic self-judgment effected by men's acceptance or rejection of the Messenger at his first Coming. So speaks the Hellenistic evangelist in unmistakable echo of Paul's great words in Rom. 8:1 ff. As we have seen, his quiet elimination of all the judgment scenes of Synoptic teaching in the discourses of the upper room bear out this sweeping advance of doctrine. Nevertheless in Jn 5:22–30 the doctrine of a messianic judgment by the Son of Man is back again. An hour is coming when "all that are in the tombs shall hear his voice and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done ill unto the resurrection of judgment." And not only is the apocalyptic function back again but elaborately defended. This claim of the Son to exercise the function of messianic Judge, says Jn 5:30 f., is no self-exaltation. It has abundant divine witness. Nor does it lack anything of the infallible wisdom of Him that looketh upon the heart:

> I can of myself do nothing: as I hear I judge: and my judgment is righteous: because I seek not mine own will, but the will of Him that sent me.

Thus our Hellenistic evangelist by resort to his doctrine of the incarnate Logos succeeds in making room for the traditional title Son of Man, together with its traditional implications, at the same time that he cuts the ground from under all the awe-inspiring phantasmagoria of apocalypse.

The bridge thus flung across the chasm between the historical utterances of Jesus and the apprehension of a later age schooled in different moulds of thought is a dizzy one. We feel no wonder that to this day only the strongest heads appear willing to attempt the passage. In reality Jesus' actual words can only have been of the type to which his hearers were accustomed. More than that; his thoughts, to be sincerely in harmony with his words, and to give to his words that ring of sincerity and conviction which no mere allegory or symbolism can take on, must have moved in the conventional channels of the time. He thought of demon-possession as his fellow-Galileans thought of it, or he could not have conveyed to them the sublime religious lesson that he did in his work of exorcism. He thought of the coming judgment-day as did the man that he revered beyond all that are born of women, else he could not have taken up the message of John the Baptist with the ardor and conviction that made it possible for his disciples to rally again to his standard even after Calvary had seemed to give the lie to all their hopes.

On the other hand there is no need to exaggerate the contrast. Mt's eschatology represents the extreme of reaction against Hel-

lenistic denial of the resurrection and judgment. In his closing great Discourse this evangelist has scraped together everything which could be found in the tradition of Jesus' teaching to emphasize that which to him is the only true eschatology, an indispensable buttress for faith and morals. Grouping and wording are also Mt's, nor has he scrupled to present what he ardently and sincerely believes Jesus *would have* said. His closing utterance, one of the grandest presentations from all antiquity of the apocalyptic picture of the final consummation, has practically nothing that can be traced back to the specific teaching of Jesus save the single principle already voiced in Mk 9:37, 41 and parallels. True, that is the very heart of all. But if we had no other witness than Mt's by which to judge of the teaching of Jesus, how different would be our conception!

Mt's picture of the Son of Man shortly to return for judgment upon "all nations" has suffered a sea-change in the sixty years or more of waiting for the second Coming. For one thing it is no longer judgment for "the twelve tribes of Israel" that Mt has in view when God grants the "restoration." It is now all humanity in all generations past or to come. Pauline missions had made the extension inevitable. Jesus' thought contemplates a Messiah who intercedes for his people at the throne of the Ancient of Days, a Messiah who promises to acknowledge there those who have confessed him before men. But such functions express only the germ of that idea which was soon to be heralded throughout the Empire, the conception of intercession for the world by one who offers his own blood as the price of the "reconciliation," and who stands as the only Mediator and Advocate for sinful humanity. To claim the office of Son of Man as heir of the creation and judge of all mankind may be a logical extension of the original meaning of the words when the end in view is universalized; but it surely is an extension, and a great one, beyond the hope which contemplates only the winning for Israel of that freedom and justice which are to be hers according to prophecy under the reign of the Son of David, once her heart is "turned back again" to Jehovah.

Moreover it is not the appeal of Jesus to the Danielic figure alone which has determined Mt's conception of him as Son of Man. Mt's employment (alone among our evangelists) of the expressions which accompany the title in the apocalypse of *Enoch* and in rabbinic literature of the apocalyptic type specially dear to Johanan ben Zacchai and to his disciple Eliezer, the "throne of glory," the "consummation of all things" and the like, show clearly enough that Mt has not taken his conception of the figure from the utterances of Jesus alone. We cannot indeed doubt that Jesus spoke of himself as the Son of Man who as Israel's representative obtains from Jehovah

(if need be beyond "the clouds of heaven") that kingdom which it is His unchangeable "decree" to give to the "little flock." The testimony of all the Gospels seems decisive as to this, nor would it be out of keeping with what we know of Jesus' sense of his mission. We cannot doubt that he promised "thrones of judgment" in the Jerusalem-to-be; for that was promised in the Passover psalm. Indeed Paul himself looks forward to a share in the judgment even of "angels" for those who are Christ's at his Coming; for to "reign with him" is above all things else to have part with him in the dispensing of justice to the poor and oppressed. In the most ancient of Church liturgies that we possess this is the part of those who "suffer with him" (II Tim. 2:11 f.). On the other hand both titles, Son of David, and Son of Man, are symbolic. To interpret them we need to go not merely to Israel's Scriptures, canonical and postcanonical, but also to the mind of Christ.

ii

From the idea of a judgment of the Son of David to that of a judgment of the Son of Man the step is not a short one, even if in the case of the primitive Church it was greatly accelerated by the course of events. The ideals of prophecy were national. It was concerned primarily with the welfare of Israel, world interests were secondary. When contact with the world-empires of post-exilic times extinguished the hope of national greatness apocalypse took the place of prophecy, transferring the scene of conflict to the heavens, where the issues at stake become those of all humanity. The mode of expression now adopted was that of grotesque oriental fancy, the mythological; the religious interest was broadened, individualized, universalized. Apocalypse undoubtedly played a very important part in the religious life of Israel at the beginning of our era, though after the rupture between Synagogue and Church the early second century saw a strong reaction in the former against the type of teaching now specially favored by the latter. In the Synagogue apocalypse was labelled the doctrine of the *merkaba* from its large use of Ezekiel's vision of the "chariot" (*merkaba*), and now, if not before, orthodox Judaism turned from it, leaving to the Church its new type of "prophecy."

We have already seen what tremendous impetus was given by the catastrophe of Calvary to Christian conviction of the imminent return of Jesus as Son of Man on the clouds of heaven to judge the world in righteousness. The enormity of human injustice on Calvary must soon be reversed by "the righteous judge." We have also seen evidence of a parallel Hellenistic development whose conception of the process by which the universal reign of righteousness is to be ushered in is profoundly different; for the Hellenistic mode of expres-

sion for the universal religious aspiration leans to the mystical rather than the mythological. As between our four Gospels Mt represents the one extreme, Jn the other; though neither is Mt exclusively apocalyptic nor Jn exclusively mystical. The writings of Paul present the most interesting example of mixture, or interchange, especially when account is taken of the advance from the earliest Epistles, with their strong emphasis on a crude Son of Man eschatology, to the latest, with their more spiritual ideal of departure to be with Christ. The existence of these two types of gospel teaching should give us pause before attempting to identify the essential message of Jesus with either.

Strong tendencies were at work from the time of the fatal Passover to the formation of our earliest gospel records to enhance with the lurid colors of apocalypse the remembered teachings of Jesus. But with all reasonable allowance for these tendencies it is impossible not to recognize that Synoptic tradition, centering upon the theme of the coming judgment of the Son of Man, is far nearer to historic truth as regards his actual utterance than Johannine, which in our fourth Gospel makes hardly a pretense of being more than an interpretation of ideas fundamental to the Christian message which could in germ be attributed to him. Among these fundamentals of the primitive evangel is the idea of Jesus' reappearance to judge the world as Son of Man. It would appear to be by way of answer to charges of presumption in making this claim that the apologetic of Jn 5:30 makes Jesus say "I can of myself do nothing: as I hear (from God) I judge: and my judgment is righteous; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of Him that sent me." The evangelist's conception of the "sending" of Jesus is based on a conception of all prophecy which so subordinates the human agency to a divine "possession" as to make the words of an Isaiah (12:38–41) or even a Caiaphas (11: 49–52) not human words at all.

No presumption can be charged against one who incarnates the eternal Logos if he undertakes even the function of universal judge. Neither inspiration nor incarnation can be understood by moderns in this sense. Nevertheless the doctrines of incarnation and inspiration advanced by our fourth evangelist have their value as reflecting something of the sense of "prophetic" authority with which Jesus actually spoke. Of his all-consuming sense of a divine mission to Israel there can be no question. Neither should it be forgotten that however apocalyptic in form might be the message which Jesus took over from the Baptist, both were more than mere apocalyptists. Especially was Jesus filled with the spirit of true pre-exilic *prophecy*, and nowhere more visibly so than when questions relating to his own agency were raised. On this issue he was emphatic in insisting that both in word

and deed he acted not for himself nor by himself. His authority was "from heaven." Setting aside particular theories of incarnation and inspiration there is, therefore, a perfectly valid sense in which Jesus would heartily have endorsed the words we have quoted from Jn 5:30 as to the authority to pronounce judgment. If he ever looked forward to any such function as Mt conceives he surely did so in this spirit of complete subordination to "the will of Him that sent" him.

Fortunately comparative study of the Gospels enables us to take at least a step or two backward from the individual conceptions of this or that particular evangelist toward those of Jesus himself. In this case probably the most helpful passage is the Q logion which in its simpler, less apocalyptic form, and certainly its more original context, is given in Lk 22:28–30 as part of the institution of the Covenant supper. We have already noted that the saying implies a reference to the Psalm of thanksgiving for the Jerusalem that is to be,

> Whither the tribes go up,
> Even the tribes of Jehovah,
> A testimony for Israel,
> To give thanks unto the name of Jehovah.
> For there are set thrones for judgment,
> The thrones of the house of David.

Its authenticity is re-enforced both by Paul's references to a judgment to come, in which the followers of Jesus will have part with him in passing sentence even upon "angels," and by the ancient Christian liturgy which seems to recall the promise to those who have shared Jesus' trials (Lk 22:28) and predicts for them a "reign" with him in his glory.

We cannot be at all sure that Jesus' anticipation of a part to be played by him in the presence of God beyond the clouds, a part corresponding to that of the Son of Man who appears in Dan. 7:13 as suppliant on Israel's behalf for the everlasting kingdom, included also a further part as the apocalyptic Son of Man to whom in Enoch is committed the judgment of the world. We can, however, at least be sure that the "kingdom of David" to which the Passover rejoicings looked forward included to his mind the executing of "judgment" for the "tribes of Jehovah." This judgment of the Son of David represents the prophetic ideal, which precedes the apocalyptic. Study of the context and bearing of the well-attested saying of Jesus on this theme should throw some light upon his conception of that "judgment" to which he looked forward, associating with himself the Twelve who had shared his trials.

We should note first of all the occasion. It is the eve of Passover, the feast of Israel's redemption. Jesus has looked forward to it with longing because of its symbolism; for then, as now, it looked not so

much back as forward. Even today the Passover ritual includes an empty chair set for "Elijah," a refrain, "This year here, next year in the land of Israel; this year as slaves, next year as free men," a rejoicing for the "third redemption" greater than out of Egypt, greater than from Babylon. These prove the spirit of the festival to be still the same as when Jesus "desired to eat this Passover" with the Twelve before his martyrdom. His declaration that his desire will meet fulfilment only "in the kingdom of God," coupled with the tokens of a sacrificial death about to be accomplished, shows what sense Jesus was giving to the observance. Death itself was not to frustrate his hope of the redemption. The "new Jerusalem," the "kingdom of David," was to be a reality in which he and they would share. Jesus makes the last supper (not, to our judgment, the Passover itself, but the preparatory *kiddush*) a "covenant" between him and his disciples like the "covenant" of the Father with himself.

He uses terms of exalted, poetic symbolism, not those of cool, deliberate definition. And yet the psalm passage employed probably reflects for us more exactly than the apocalyptic figures of Jesus' preaching in Galilee his personal expectation of the divine judgment wherein the wrongs of Israel are to be righted. If we hold temporarily in abeyance the fervid pictures of "wrath to come" which had characterized the preaching of repentance since John had come "in the spirit and power of Elijah"—if we realize that now, the work accomplished, the trials over, save the last, Jesus among the Twelve is encouraging them to look forward with something of his own indomitable faith, we shall appreciate better the tone of this utterance. But we must also realize that from the beginning there had been a difference of tone between Jesus' preaching and John's. His had been a proclamation of "glad tidings to the poor." His disciples had been "sons of the bride-chamber." The messianic judgment to which he is now looking forward was something prophets and kings had longed to see. It was a consummation for which the prayers of Israel had ascended to God both day and night with greater fervency than those of the widow of the parable importuning the unjust judge to give her justice. This aspect of Jesus' work reflects his feeling as a Jewish patriot, an aspect which also demands consideration; for in spite of Jesus' strong repulsion of everything savoring of Zealot political aims there were features of his work which made him for the humbler classes of Israel the true Son of David. Yes, even after Calvary, and as long as the mother-church in Jerusalem continued under control of his personal following, its watchword was the restoration of the ruined "tabernacle of David."

It is quite true that Jesus had neither part nor lot with Zealot nationalism as such. The Pharisees, but for their legalistic trend would have more easily won his sympathy by their pacifistic quietism.

The purely religious nature of the redemption to which Jesus looked forward made his movement quite as free as the Pharisean from all menace to Roman control. But this does not mean that Jesus' aims had not a social aspect, not to say political. Jesus' disciple Simon the Zealot may be presumed to have given up Zealot methods for achieving that freedom and justice his people craved when he became a follower of the Nazarene. But this does not imply that Simon or any of his fellow-disciples had been asked to relinquish their aspirations for freedom and justice both social and national. On the contrary, their adhesion to Jesus may well have been due to their correct apprehension that freedom and justice were more surely to be won under this leadership than under any other.

Neither the following which Jesus secured during his lifetime and retained after his death as "King of the Jews," nor his crucifixion under this charge by Pilate, can be wholly accounted for without taking into the reckoning this alleged "false witness." The pressure his enemies undoubtedly brought to bear upon Pilate could never have succeeded against a mere rabbi. The messianistic character of the Baptist's movement at its beginning led the suspicious Antipas to put John to death as a precaution. There was still enough of the same quasi-political character about its continuation under Jesus to give color of likelihood to the charge which brought him to the cross.

The charge was thoroughly unjust. Not, however, because Jesus was indifferent to the social and political wrongs which had ever been nearest the heart of the prophets, but because he sought the remedy along purely religious lines.

The historico-critical reader of the Gospels should take account of the intense apologetic interest of all our evangelists to make it apparent that the charge under which Jesus suffered the cross was totally groundless. We must go back to conditions as they were in Galilee even before the Church took up its mission of proclaiming the Christ about to descend from heaven, to appreciate that modicum of truth which gave the charge its color of plausibility, Jesus' adoption of the dangerous rôle of Messiah after the martyrdom of John.

Social conditions were probably much more galling to the ordinary peasant or artisan of Galilee in Jesus' time than political. Bevan, Simkhovitch, Klausner and McCown have reminded us of the economic changes that were gradually crushing out the small peasant proprietor of pre-Roman times in Syria and reducing the free wage-earner to the level of the slaves with whom he was obliged to compete. The cry of the Zealot nationalist still availed to rouse the patriotic ardor of some, especially in rural Galilee; but their numbers dwindled as experience of the exchange from native war-lord to Roman governor taught the peasant farmer how slight was the alleviation of growing

burdens of taxation and forced labor which any such exchange could be expected to bring. There were dreams of freedom under native sovereignty. It was to come from the tribe of Judah or the tribe of Levi according as one looked to the prophecies of the Son of David or fixed his hopes on some scion of the Hasmonean family. For Herod Agrippa, who on his mother's side was a Hasmonean, made this a cornerstone of his policy. But to men of sober mind the political prospect was anything but alluring. There had come to be a time when the descendants of the Maccabean patriots would gladly have accepted a governor at the hands of a Seleucid king in Antioch, if thereby they might be rid of their own Hasmonean ruler. Lately, within easy recollection of Jesus' contemporaries, a delegation had gone from Judea to Rome to ask incorporation into the Empire rather than continue nominal independence under Archelaus. The longing for political freedom should not be overrated. If the Pharisees could get along under the yoke of Rome with only a religious hope of freedom in "the world to come" to lighten it we may probably conclude that the average fisherman, artisan, or peasant landholder of Galilee was ready to put up with such measure of peace and order as Roman government brought, if only he were permitted to answer according to his custom and ability the ever-pressing questions, What shall we eat and what shall we drink, and wherewithal shall we be clothed? Native justice was hardly an improvement on Roman.

Not political so much as social and economic inequality was sorely felt. Conditions as reflected in S, or in the L source of Lk are not easily borne. The widow vainly importuning for justice, the penniless Lazarus begging food at the door of the heartless rich man, the laborers standing all through the heat of the day in the village marketplace, ready enough to work but idle "because no man hath hired us," these tell of the real unrest. These are the same harsh social conditions which call forth the indignation of James. On the one side we see servile flattery of the rich (Jas. 2:2–4), on the other oppression of the poor by corruption or misuse of the courts. There is luxury and delicate living at the cost of laborers in the fields whose wages have been kept back by fraud (Jas. 2:7; 5:4–6). Just such conditions called forth the fiercest invective of the ancient prophets, and they cannot have failed to stir the heart of Jesus. Easily can we picture him in the synagogue along with his fellow-artisans of Nazareth, or later amid the group of peasant-farmers, fisher-folk or laborers who hung on his words of "glad tidings to the poor," as all offer together the prayer appointed from generations before the coming of "the Son of David,"

> O restore our judges as formerly, and our counsellors as at the beginning; and remove from us sorrow and sighing; and reign over us, Thou O Lord alone, in grace and mercy, and give us justice.

The prayer has the response,

> Blessed art Thou, O Lord the King, for Thou lovest righteousness and justice.

Again the prayer resumes,

> Cause speedily to flourish the offspring of David Thy servant, and let his horn be exalted in Thy salvation: for Thy salvation do we hope every day.

And the response is,

> Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who causest the horn of salvation to flourish.

If the "horn of salvation" to arise "in the house of David" (*cf.* Lk 1:69) meant anything to the common people of Israel in Jesus' time it surely meant help from the great King who "loveth righteousness and justice." For what else did David celebrate in the Psalm for a greater than he to sit upon his throne? (Ps. 72.)

> Give the king Thy judgments, O God,
> And Thy righteousness unto the king's son.
> Let him judge Thy people with righteousness,
> And Thy poor with justice.
> The mountains shall bring peace to the people,
> And the hills, through righteousness.
> Let him judge the poor of the people,
> And save the children of the needy,
> And break in pieces the oppressor.
> . . . . . .
> All kings shall fall down before him;
> All nations shall serve him.
> For he will deliver the needy when he crieth,
> And the poor that hath no helper.
> He will have pity on the weak and needy,
> And the lives of the needy he will save.
> He will redeem their life from oppression and violence,
> And precious will their blood be in his sight.

One cannot well doubt that to the common people of Jesus' time the "thrones of judgment" of the New Jerusalem, the "thrones of the house of David" were a vivid reality in their dream of "the third redemption." If Jesus gave assurance of "thrones of judgment" in his parting words to the Twelve at the Covenant supper, it can only be that he looked forward to taking part with his followers in reversing the conditions of injustice and wrong under which Israel had so long been groaning. Yes, we must either discredit one of the best attested logia of the Gospels or else admit that Jesus dared to promise this under the very shadow of the cross in the name of the Father who had "covenanted" to him a reign of justice and righteousness.

Such, then, was the messianic "judgment," the prophetic ideal, to which we may be certain Jesus looked forward, a "judgment" in which he, in company with those who had stood by him in his days of trial, should take the leading part. This judgment of the Son of David has indeed a somewhat different aspect from that judgment of the Son of Man which came soon to occupy the center of the stage for the primitive Church. But post-exilic Judaism saw the development of the apocalyptic out of the prophetic ideal. May it not well be from the simpler conception reflected in Jesus' application of the Passover theme to his own messianic calling, that the universalized apocalyptic conception of apostolic times has grown?

iii

It was inevitable that Mt's fourth Book should lead up to a great Discourse on the Consummation as the climax of his Gospel. Such is the natural development in similar works of edification such as the *Didaché;* moreover the plan of Mk, rigidly followed by Mt since the middle of his Gospel, made this disposition of his remaining material a certainty. For the first part of Division A there was very little beyond Mk's story of the Perean journey, a story which is quite probably filled out by Mk with anecdotes of uncertain date and occasion. After this, however, Mk gave a relatively full report of the Passover visit to Jerusalem, which Mt makes basic, though Lk from this point on rests more largely upon L. Mt finds room in the story of the Perean journey to insert an almost completely rewritten form of the logion about the thrones of the house of David, transferring it (together with its context of the Quarrel for Precedence which Mk had already given this earlier placing) from the scene of the Covenant supper. He has one other much larger addition to make, the parable of the Dissatisfied Wage-earners (Mt 20:1–16). For this Mt finds a place after the saying of Mk 10:31 "But many that are first shall be last and the last first." As we have seen in our introduction to Book V the parable may well be derived from S, though its location by Mt at this point appears to be due to misapprehension of the sense.

In the story of the Passover visit to Jerusalem Mt's transcription of Mk needs little comment. We have noted already the slight addition concerning Acclamation in the Temple (above, p. 116) also the Q addition after Mk's account of the demand of the Sanhedrin for the authority Jesus had exercised in cleansing the temple (Mt 21:28–32 = Lk 7:29 f.), a case in which the Matthean placing is much preferable to Lk's. We have also considered the rewriting of the Q parable of the Slighted Invitation, a recast whose features readily explain why Mt inserts it after that of the Usurping Husbandmen (Mt 21:33–46 = Mk 12:1–12). Thus the three Vineyard parables, the Penitent

Younger Son (21:28–32), the Usurping Husbandmen (21:33–46), and the Slighted Invitation (22:1–14) form a group well adapted to the situation to which Mt is leading up. He now subjoins only Mk's narrative introduction to the discourse, viz., the Debates in the Temple with Pharisees, Sadducees, and scribes (Mt 22:15–46 = Mk 12: 13–37), to conclude Division A.

Division B rests as usual primarily on Mk. Of its three long chapters the first, denouncing Woes on Scribes and Pharisees as responsible for all the disaster Israel has suffered (ch. 23), has indeed but a slender foundation in Mk 12:38–40. The remainder consists largely of Q, expanded by some P additions. Verses 8–10 forbid the application to Church teachers of honorific titles applied to leaders of the Synagogue. Verses 15–22 denounce the propaganda and false casuistry of the scribes and Pharisees. The rest of the total of Seven Woes on "scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites" is drawn from S and capped with the Plaint of Rejected Wisdom (23:34–39 = Lk 11:49–51; 13:34 f.), which Mt links on by the bitter words,

> Fill ye up, then, the measure of your fathers,
> Ye serpents, ye brood of vipers,
> How can ye escape the judgment of Gehenna!

Whatever the context from which Mt draws his material for this denunciation the grouping and elaboration are too near to that of 12:33–37 for us to mistake here the editorial hand.

The second element of the Discourse (ch. 24) again rests on Mk with but slight admixture from S (verses 26–28 = Lk 17:23 f., 37 supply the original from which Mk 13:21–23 = Mt 24:23–25 has been taken), and only a switching at the close to the fuller, Q form (verses 37–51 = Lk 17:22–37; 12:39–46). Here, however, in the exhortations to Watchfulness for the End, Mt finds the nucleus and suggestion for his parting message from Jesus to the Church. Two parables, one of Readiness for the Coming (25:1–13), the other on Constancy in Well-doing (14–30), lead up to the finale, a grandiose description of the Judgment at the end of the World (31–46).

The first of the two parables (Wise and Foolish Virgins) merely expands the figurative beginning of the Q section last employed (*cf.* Lk 12:35–38); the second (Entrusted Funds) recasts that related by Lk as given on a different occasion (Lk 19:12–27).[2] Taken together with the scene of Judgment by the Son of Man the three utterances supply an ending to the Discourses of Jesus admirably adapted to Mt's purpose. They furnish just that message from the Lord which his Ephesian contemporary constructs in the form of professed apocalypse. The "Prophecy of John" given out to "the churches of

[2] See above, pp. 94 ff.

Asia" in 93 A.D. seeks to rekindle their "first love" and zeal for "good works" by an assurance that the Lord's Coming is near and "his reward is with him." Mt hopes to stem the tide of moral relaxation and the inroads of the false prophets who teach "lawlessness," by sanctions of everlasting reward and punishment. As we have seen, this is characteristic of Jewish-christian effort at the time. In the struggle against "acute Hellenization" and the perils it involved in the post-apostolic age the remedy of eschatological sanctions was eagerly applied by leaders of the Church. For centuries it remained their strongest bulwark against moral laxity. Christianity of the Graeco-Roman world as a whole responded to the expectation of a Christ about to descend from the right hand of the Father "to judge the quick and the dead." Eighteen centuries have scarcely dimmed it, or relaxed the tension of its moral spur.

But the twentieth century experiences already a spreading decay in its efficacy. On the other hand there has come with this growing loss of cogency in the cry "Flee from the wrath to come" a dawning apprehension that perhaps Jesus' gospel of peace, his message of reconciliation to the compassionate Father, did not chiefly consist of a new and higher legalism, appealing with redoubled vehemence to men's hope of reward and fear of punishment. Today men are asking whether the Hellenistic Gospel, in spite of its later date and less historical method, does not do better justice than the Synoptic to the true "heart of Christ."

It cannot be claimed as respects the form of its eschatological teaching that the fourth Gospel can compare with its predecessors in giving the actual utterances of Jesus. Probably the evangelist himself would not venture to advance such a claim. The fourth evangelist is not attempting to record but to translate, and his translation is not a mere rendering of words into equivalent words of another tongue, but a rendering of thoughts into equivalent thoughts of a different world of religious apprehension. Jn's predecessor had been Paul. And in the Pauline half-completed transition from Jewish apocalypse to Hellenistic mysticism we have the best example of that teaching of the living Spirit which is claimed by Jn, a teaching without which Christianity itself is doomed to go the way of all mere book-religion. In bringing to a close our Studies in Mt with a modern valuation of that theme which in Mt's time might well seem the greatest and most momentous of all, we must make some attempt to follow the example set by Paul and Jn. We must endeavor to penetrate the mind of Christ in his conviction of the triumph of righteousness. For in Jesus' time, and among his fellow countrymen that goal of humanity's religious hope was represented by the doctrine of Jehovah's Judgment and the establishment by divine intervention of the kingdom of David.

iv

We have seen that the later, universalized form of the Jewish hope of redemption is expressed in apocalypse. The kingdom looked forward to is "not of this world" but a new, supernatural, glorified world. The conflict is no longer with Edom or Moab or Ammon or Syria, not with Egypt or Babylonia, but with the powers of evil "in the heavenly places," authors of the curse that lies upon humanity. The deliverance also comes not from the arm of flesh, but "legions of angels." Today the fact that Jesus' conception of exorcism belongs to this obsolete mode of thought no longer makes difficulty for thoughtful students of the New Testament. We realize that the kernel of unalterable religious truth must be extricated from the shell of transitory convention. In like manner the parables of the kingdom are clothed in the garb of contemporary Jewish thought; they presuppose the background of apocalypse. But there is something of Jesus' own in them which gives them a meaning beyond even the message of John. With John the coming of the kingdom was imminent. With Jesus the kingdom itself was immanent. The inference is clear. If not today then in the easily foreseeable future Christianity will be constrained for its very life to apply a similar process of historically sympathetic appreciation to the whole domain of New Testament eschatology. Only then can we make of this obsolete mode of thought an effective application. Its moral values will be lost, the "fruits of righteousness" will not appear, if we take translation to mean the mere substitution of word for word and letter for letter.

Jesus' doctrine of judgment to come had not yet been fully universalized by apocalyptic infusion. Still less can this be said of the preaching of the Baptist which Jesus took up and carried forward. John's preaching of the coming wrath conforms to the prophetic type, almost uncontaminated by apocalyptic. Its scene is neither cosmic nor other-worldly, but the soil of Palestine. Its agent has no resemblance to Rhadamanthus, or Osiris or Ahura-mazda. The expectation is undoubtedly catastrophic. Redemption takes place by direct intervention of Jehovah on behalf of his people. But there is no place in John's thought for a Danielic Son of Man, much less for the Enoch figure. Jehovah does not indeed appear in person. He acts through his "angel," as is the case even in pre-exilic thought. Had John's expectation been that of a visible appearance of Jehovah Himself he would not have used the figure of stooping down to loose his sandal-string in comparing himself with the "greater one" to come after. John thinks of himself as the herald of warning. He thinks of the executioner of Jehovah's wrath about to follow him as "the angel of the covenant" appointed at Horeb to go before the

people to their destined place, one in whom is Jehovah's Name (His representative) who will be unsparing in his treatment of sin (Ex. 23:20 f.). This appears from Jesus' quotation from Mal. 3:1 ff. in combination with the Exodus passage; for in reality John's message of judgment to come was simply an echo of Malachi, just as Jesus' thought of John was itself couched in terms of Mal. 6:5 f.

Except for a suffusion of the whole with the conceptions of the post-resurrection period embodied in the title Son of Man, Jesus' preaching in Galilee of judgment to come, as reported by the Synoptists, is as purely prophetic and non-apocalyptic as John's. Jesus also looks forward to a catastrophic divine intervention which shall "restore the kingdom to Israel" and destroy the wicked and the unfaithful. If he uses the term Son of Man at this time (a matter of serious critical doubt) it is only in such generally conventionalized expressions as "the Day" or "the Coming" or "the Judgment of the Son of Man." The reference is impersonal and without any tendency on Jesus' part to identify this agent of Jehovah's judgment with himself. Passages of the Galilean period in which Jesus clearly applied the title to himself must introduce it from later usage inasmuch as self-identification with this superhuman figure of Danielic or Enochic apocalypse would have resulted in immediate uproar instead of the placidity with which Jesus' auditors receive his words.

An example of the distortion resulting from the later tendency to carry back the apocalyptic Son of Man doctrine into the record of Jesus' preaching may be seen in Mt's version of the Q warning not to depend on pleas of outward connection with the Judge as compared with Lk's. Mt has rewritten in 7:21–23 the closing exhortation of the discourse on Filial Righteousness, a plea to show loyalty not in lip-service but in a heart-renewal productive of the fruits of action. He transforms it into a warning against the "false prophets" destitute of good works. In 7:21 f. he gives an apocalyptic turn to the saying "Why call ye me Master, Master, and do not what I say?" by making it refer to the last judgment ("Not everyone that saith to me, Master, Master, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that does the will of my Father in heaven"), appending to it in rewritten form the Q warning above referred to. Comparison of the parallels will show at a glance how an objective reference to the impartiality of the divine Judge has been transformed by Mt into an implied claim on Jesus' part to be himself this divine Judge.

Lk 13:26 f.	Mt 7:22 f.
Then he will begin to say, We have eaten and drunk in thy presence, and thou didst walk [a] in our streets. But ye will say, I tell you I know not whence you come. Depart from me all ye that work unrighteousness.	Many will say ***to me in that day,*** Master, Master, ***did we not prophesy in thy name, and in thy name cast out evil spirits, and in thy name do many miracles?*** Then will ***I*** declare to them, I never knew you. Depart from me ye workers of ***lawlessness.***

On the principle above stated it is impossible to doubt that the Lukan form, which merely teaches that the judgment of the divine representative pictured in the parable as "the master of the house" will be solely upon grounds of conduct, irrespective of race, is the more authentic; whereas Mt (following his constant propensity) has substituted a personal claim on Jesus' part to be this divine Judge ("will say to *me*," "*I* will declare," etc.). The tendency thus noted in Mt cannot but react upon our judgment of his representation in other cases.

But Jesus himself was compelled by the course of events to trench on the field of apocalyptic. The transition is made at Caesarea Philippi. Driven out from Galilee after the martyrdom of John, with a similar fate before his own eyes should he not consent to abandon his prophetic vocation, Jesus was compelled to overpass the border of other-worldliness. He could not otherwise meet the question for himself and his disciples what would become of the cause to which they were pledged in case both he and they should meet a fate like John's. The answer is found by virtue of a faith which reaches out for divine help even beyond the grave. Scriptural warrant is sought (probably by Jesus himself) in Daniel's figure of "one like unto a son of man" (a mortal) brought on the clouds of heaven to the Ancient of Days to receive as Israel's representative the "everlasting kingdom." We may take this appeal of Jesus to the prophecy of Dan. 7:13 as the starting point for the later development. From this time onward the application of the title Son of Man, both in the original Danielic sense and also in the sense assumed in *Enoch* of universal judge, is naturally applied to Jesus in the records as if it had really been his own "favorite self-designation."

The conception of messianic judgment through the Son of David is the common root, universalized first in Jewish apocalypse, later in Hellenistic mysticism. Its currency in all Jewish circles in Jesus' time, as well as the sense in which it was understood, is placed beyond dispute by the ancient prayer of the Synagogue known as the *Shemoneh Esreh* or "Eighteen" (*sc.* benedictions), a prayer so constantly and universally employed in the Synagogue as to be referred to as "the" Prayer. The antiquity of this litany and its close relation to Gospel

[a] So the Curetonian Syriac.

ideas have been shown in a recent article entitled "the Q Section on John the Baptist and the *Shemoneh Esreh*." [4] When we observe the occasion of John's question and the nature of Jesus' answer it becomes immediately apparent that the Coming One of whom both are speaking is certainly not the dread agent of Jehovah's fiery wrath, the angel of the Covenant sent with winnowing fan and unquenchable fire to purge Jehovah's threshing-floor. We have only to compare the prayers for the justice and healing to be brought by the Son of David in the *Shemoneh Esreh* (Benedictions 5–8,11, and 14 f.) to see that it is this ideal kingdom of the prophets (not the apocalyptists) which is in mind. Even if we grant to the most radical school of criticism that the Message of John's Disciples is a fiction designed to bring out the contrast between John's followers and the Christian group, still we shall find ourselves compelled to take as the earliest Christian ideal the nationalistic of the *Shemoneh Esreh* and not the cosmological of the apocalypses with their other-worldly, non-natural imagery.

For the earliest Christian ideal of Judgment to Come, though it belongs to the realm of religion, not of political ambition, and is thought of as *introduced* by catastrophic divine intervention, is in itself purely of the type contemplated by prophets and Psalmists. "Restore our judges as formerly, and our counsellors as at the beginning" is a petition contemplating the picture of Ex. 18:13–27, where Moses on Jethro's advice appoints out of all the people

> "able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating unjust gain."

Of these we read that they "judged the people at all seasons; the hard causes they brought unto Moses, but every small matter they judged themselves." Similarly with the petition for the restoration of Jerusalem and establishment in it of "the throne of David." The firstfruit of this restoration of the kingdom to Israel is to be justice to the widow and fatherless, the poor and him that hath no helper, a gift through "the offspring of David, God's servant," from the One who "loves righteousness and justice." But it is no supernatural Being who administers this justice. True, it is inaugurated by God's intervention, which destroys all hostile powers and rebuilds Jerusalem as "a structure everlasting." But the administration of the divine government is given over to "the offspring of David"; and it is the appointees of this Son of David who occupy the "thrones of judgment, the thrones of the house of David."

The conception voiced by Jesus on the eve of the fatal Passover is identical. In spite of Mt's substitution of the apocalyptic form "In

[4] *JBL*, XLV ½ (1926), pp. 23–56. A date earlier than 70 A.D. for Blessing 14 may well be doubted, but even this unquestionably reflects the messianism of the Synagogue in Jesus' time.

the Regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit upon the throne of his glory" (Mt 19:28) the original of Lk 22:28 f. is completely free from this apocalyptic element. Jesus simply promises the fulfilment of the hope of Israel as expressed in the prayer for the building of Jerusalem in Ps. 122 and *Shemoneh Esreh* 14 f. The "thrones of judgment" which the Twelve are to occupy in the restored Zion are not places of power from which they may lord it over their brethren, but opportunities of vindication for all that are poor and oppressed among the people. The Twelve are to do what the appointees of Moses are expected to do in the story of Jethro's counsel, judge the small matters themselves and bring the hard causes to their Master, who reigns as Son of David. In this sense they exercise judgment with him and share in his reign as they have shared in his trials and suffering. Reigning in the sense the Gentiles give to the word is expressly repudiated (Lk 22:24–30). If this be a promise of reward to the Twelve the element of reward lies only in the larger opportunity for service, as in the parable of the Entrusted Funds. The real value of the teaching lies not in the nature of the expectation, for this only repeats in adapted form the longing for the reign of justice and righteousness embodied in Psalm and Prayer alike for the "kingdom of David." It lies rather in the fact that Jesus' faith flings this assurance of God's victory in the teeth of the powers of darkness and death.

The longing for a reign of righteousness and justice is as wide as humanity. In every monotheistic religion it seeks expression in the belief that

somehow good
Shall be the final goal of ill.

The reason for the particular form it first assumed in Christianity is that Christianity was rooted in Hebrew soil. The doctrine of the kingdom of God which is central to it was an inheritance from Judaism, and this doctrine had passed through more than one stage of growth. With the gradual extinction of national hopes, accompanied by closer contact with Egyptian, Babylonian, Persian, and Greek world empires, the older, prophetic hope for an ideal kingdom of David gave way to the other-worldly dreams of apocalypse. How far this process had proceeded in the time of Jesus it is difficult to say; but at least it is certain that new life in a "world to come" was now the central feature of religious hope for the majority of Jesus' fellow-countrymen and contemporaries. This new world was to be ushered in by catastrophic divine intervention, after which the "everlasting kingdom" of David would begin. Early Christian propaganda took over with redoubled emphasis the apocalyptic ideal of the Coming of the Son of Man on the clouds of heaven for judgment upon the world,

leaving to the little company of apostles and kindred of the Lord in Jerusalem the more specially social and political aspects of the hope.

Outside the circle where the Galilean following of Jesus in Jerusalem continued to look for a rebuilding of the ruined "tabernacle of David" to form a center for a rule of righteousness over the Gentiles, Christian apocalypse found itself rivalled by other eschatologies of different type. Among these the distinctive common feature was a reversal of the Jewish conception of the homeward journey of the soul. Instead of a gathering of the elect from the four corners of the earth toward Jerusalem, there to reign with the Messiah, who descends from heaven clothed with glory, power, and authority from Jehovah, Christians of Gentile origin put forward the belief "that when we die our souls are taken to heaven," a heresy intolerable to men of Papias' and Justin's way of thinking. The difference is indeed immense. The two ideals are literally as far apart as heaven from earth. But strangely enough the modern, brought up on an eschatology which to Polycarp, Papias and Justin would be anathema, can scarcely realize that a difference exists. The modern Christian insists on having both the New Jerusalem of the Jews and the mansions in the skies of Gentile eschatology.

If, then, the hope of heaven can bridge such a chasm as this, finding no practical difference between that aspiration which dreams of return to Jerusalem in a restored body from burial in the ends of the earth, and that other which contemplates a soaring into the empyrean by souls which have shaken off the burden of the flesh, there should be no need to despair of bringing into harmony the Jewish and the Greek conception of the reign of righteousness, and of the divine power by which that reign is to be brought about.

Paul holds that a day is soon to dawn in which God will "judge the world in righteousness by that man whom He hath ordained" (Acts 17:31; *cf.* Rom. 2:16). Yet admittedly it was possible even in Paul's time for Christians to entertain a different view of the divine judgment. It was possible to regard it as something already achieved in the first coming of the Light of God into the world. Because there is a kind of natural gravitation of goodness toward the light and evil toward the darkness. As Jn has it

> He that believeth on him is not judged; he that believeth not hath been judged already. . . . And this is the judgment, that the light is come into the world, and men loved the darkness rather than the light because their works were evil (Jn. 3:17–19).

Paul believed in a real appearance of the risen Christ to judgment, a Day of Jehovah when we should "all be made manifest before the judgment seat of Christ; that each one may receive the things done in the body whether they be good or bad" (II Cor. 5:10). But

he seems to realize that this conception of a "day in which God will judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ" is not the only form in which a true doctrine of divine retribution may find expression; for he adds immediately that this is "according to my gospel" (Rom. 2:16), leaving room for other conceptions besides the apocalyptic.

The modern man is constrained to avail himself of this liberty of choice between two methods of universalization of the common doctrine. Mt, the "apocalyptic evangelist," has done his very utmost to win the world to the conception developed in Judaism, that judgment of the Son of Man which expresses its longing for the world-wide triumph of righteousness. The success which Mt's doctrine attained was enormous, largely because in general background and mould of thought it *did* represent the actual preaching of Jesus. But a day has come when form must give way to substance, when the conventional Jewish idea of the reign of God, its inception and its continuance, must give way to others of larger scope. Only through sympathetic understanding and appreciation of the prophetic, and after that of the apocalyptic conception, shall we be prepared to frame a consistently Christian doctrine of divine retribution, that kingdom of justice and righteousness which is the desire of all the nations; for the God that "loveth righteousness and judgment" has implanted this faith and hope in the breasts of all. Since the time is not far off for this restatement of Christian doctrine, we may well be thankful that our religion's strength is derived not from its Jewish ancestry alone. From the very earliest times there existed also a gospel according to the Hellenists, a gospel for which Paul claimed and obtained unshackled freedom of interpretation. In this Hellenistic tradition the example is set of penetration beneath the transitory form to the enduring substance. Whatever balance is then struck between Jewish and Greek modes of thought, apocalypse and mysticism, our ultimate confidence in the coming reign of justice will still be the indomitable, victorious faith of Jesus Christ in the God "that loveth righteousness and truth."

PART V

APPENDED NOTES

APPENDED NOTE I

THE DATE OF PAPIAS

It is unfortunately impossible to determine within close limits the date of Papias' *Exegeses*. Since Harnack's *Chronologie* (1897) the majority of critics have tended toward Harnack's dating between 140 and 160 A.D. (Moffatt, *Introd.*, 1911, p. 185), but with important exceptions. Zahn still defends a date as early as 125, and Vernon Bartlet (s.v. "Papias" in *HDB*) would even carry this back to 115 on the ground of Irenaeus' reference to Papias as a "comrade" (ἑταῖρος) of Polycarp (*ob.* 155), and of the close kinship of Papias' work with the letter of Polycarp to the Philippians (*c.* 115). The date adopted in the present work, *c.* 140, takes middle ground between those advocated by the great English scholars of the last century, Westcott (140–150) and Lightfoot (130–140).

Bartlet's arguments seem equally applicable to any date earlier than 155, and Zahn is an avowed apologist for the Irenaean tradition which makes both Polycarp and Papias actual disciples of the Apostle John! Lightfoot and Westcott argue with greater force from the antignostic utterances of Papias' Preface, which suggest a date subsequent to the appearance of the *Exegetica* of Basilides (Alexandria, *c.* 130). This argument may perhaps be somewhat re-enforced by the known effect of Hadrian's decree of exile from Jerusalem (135 A.D.) against all circumcised persons, a decree which dispersed the body of "elders the disciples (or 'successors') of the Apostles," till then regarded as arbiters of orthodoxy for the Church catholic. Papias considers himself uniquely qualified for the task of declaring the true meaning of the "commandments delivered by the Lord to the faith" by his ability to report utterances of the Apostles transmitted through this body of "elders." But he clearly distinguishes an earlier time (ποτέ) in which he had been able to question these "elders the disciples of the Apostles" on his own account (apparently) without intermediary, from a later period, extending down to the time of writing, during which he could only question chance travellers who "came his way" and could report what these "elders *had* said as well as what Aristion and the elder John, the disciples of the Lord (for which we should probably read by change of two letters "the disciples of *these*") *were* saying." If "the Elder John" can be identified (as the present writer has argued, following the lead of Scholten and Schlatter) with John of Jerusalem, middle link of the succession of Jerusa-

lem "elders" in the succession of that church from 62 to 135 A.D., an "Elder John" whose death is dated by Epiphanius in the eighteenth year of Trajan (117 A.D.), the period of Papias' collection of "traditions of the elders" will have extended at least down to the later years of Trajan. In any event the momentous decree of Hadrian, destroying the chief reliance of men who like Polycarp and Hegesippus felt it necessary to fall back on "the tradition handed down from the very first" against the perversions of heretical teaching, would furnish the strongest possible incentive to such "comrades" as Papias to publish their stores of "traditions of the elders." The scene chosen by Justin, Papias' Roman contemporary, for his colloquy with Trypho in Ephesus, is that of a Jew driven out from Palestine by "the war." Just as this Jewish dispersion in 132–135 serves Justin as a natural setting for his (real or fictitious) *Dialogue with Trypho*, written *c.* 152, so it would be natural for Papias in Hierapolis of Phrygia to give out his *Interpretations of the Lord's Oracles*, largely based, as they were, on the accumulations of a lifetime devoted to the quest of "traditions of the Elders," at the moment when the sources of such tradition had ceased to flow.

The later years of the period fixed by Harnack (140–160) are excluded in the judgment of the present writer by the indications of acquaintance in the writings of Justin Martyr with the work of Papias. This appears from Justin's statements as to the origin of the Gospels of Mt and Mk, and more especially from his eschatology, which not only reflects Papias' tradition of the Elders describing the marvellous fertility of Palestine and harmlessness of the wild beasts in messianic times, but particularizes as to the apostolic authorship of the Revelation of John, which Papias had ardently defended. The "many church fathers" whom Eusebius considers to have taken their eschatology from Papias, down to and including Irenaeus, must surely be understood to include also Justin. If so, we can hardly date this "only work" of Papias later than *c.* 145.

But a more cogent reason for our adoption of a date not later than 140, is the absence of any trace in any surviving extract from Papias, as well as the absence of any reference to Papias on the part of the great numbers who resorted to his book as the great repository of information concerning gospel origins, looking to the defense of the authority and authenticity of Lk. The onslaught of the Gnostic arch-heretic Marcion, which reverberated through all Christendom not more than a year or two after 140, was principally based on the charge that the Gospel of Lk, in the form current in the Church catholic, was interpolated and garbled in opposition to the teaching of Paul. Had Papias known of this charge he could hardly have avoided some reference to the work of our third evangelist. Such a defense of

the authenticity of Lk by Papias could hardly fail to be transmitted to us either through those who during the controversy with Marcion made use of Papias for other purposes, such as Irenaeus, or through Eusebius, who explicitly promises his readers to communicate whatever he can find in early writers regarding the origin of the Gospels.

The silence which seems to have obtained in Papias' work concerning the Gospel of Lk is much more significant than his contradiction in the fragment transmitted by Apollinaris of Laodicea (not Apollinaris of Hierapolis, Papias' successor) of Lk's story of the fate of Judas. For the fragment is equally contradictory of Mt. Traditions of the Elders, it would seem, could be adopted by Papias even when to modern critics they seem irreconcilable with what Papias regarded as written apostolic authority. The business of harmonization between Gospels, or between Gospels and traditions, Papias could safely leave to his readers. But to completely ignore the onslaught of Marcion against the authenticity and authority of Lk does not seem a likely thing for the great champion of catholic evangelical tradition, if he wrote at a date shortly after the appearance of Marcion's writings. A date between 135 and 145, or more specifically about 140, seems therefore to the present writer most conformable to the evidence at our command.

It is perhaps not superfluous to add that the date once advocated on the basis of an alleged fragment of Papias in Philip of Sidé, declaring that some of the subjects of Jesus' life-restoring power had "survived till the time of Hadrian," has no value. It would indeed seem to be implied that the author of the statement was himself writing under a later emperor; but it is now generally recognized that Philip of Sidé merely rests, as usual, on Eusebius, and that in transcribing the material of Eusebius regarding Papias and *Quadratus*, whom Eusebius reports as making statements of this kind immediately after his statements in regard to Papias, Philip of Sidé has confused the two. For in delivering his Apology to Hadrian at the time of the emperor's visit to Athens (125 A.D.) *Quadratus* did in fact declare that some of these subjects of Jesus' healing power had survived "even to *our* times." These are the actual words of Quadratus given in the verbatim extract of Eusebius (*HE*, IV, 3). Eusebius' order (probably based on his *Chronicon*, in which he confesses having antedated Papias) is misleading; for he places the activity of Papias before that of Quadratus, dating the latter correctly in the reign of Hadrian. This also has been alleged as ground for giving Papias an early dating. The misplacement may well have contributed to the confusion in the mind of Philip of Sidé, but it really reflects only the lingering influence of Irenaeus, by whose exaggerated estimate of the "ancientness" of Papias Eusebius had been affected in preparing the *Chronicon*. In

the *History* Eusebius himself acknowledges and corrects this error, but apparently did not go to the length of transposing the order of Papias and Quadratus in his story. He was doubtless correct in believing both Papias and Quadratus to have flourished under Hadrian (117–138), though the *Apology* of Quadratus (c. 125) was published earlier than the *Exegeses* of Papias.

For reasons above outlined, we may take 140 to be the approximately correct date for this fundamental work concerned with gospel origins. Papias, the author of the five-book composition entitled *Interpretations of the Lord's Oracles*, was indeed a "comrade" of Polycarp, who survived until 154. He wrote somewhat later than Quadratus, who could assure Hadrian that some of the subjects of Jesus' healing power had survived to within the memory of his own generation. Quadratus may have been born as early as Polycarp (69 A.D.). Papias was probably younger than either, though contemporary and "comrade" of both.

APPENDED NOTE II

THE TERM "LOGIA"

Λόγιον, diminutive of the ordinary noun λόγος ("word") is commonly used by secular Greek authors to signify a brief utterance, more especially the sacred utterances of the Delphic or other "oracle." Biblical writers employ it in a similar general sense, as when in I Pt. 4:11 sobriety of speech is commended in the exhortation "If any man speaketh (in the assembly) let it be as it were oracles (λόγια) of God." Usually Jewish writers, canonical or uncanonical, apply the term to the inspired utterances of the Old Testament, especially the commandments given at Sinai, as when Paul counts it a high prerogative of Israel that to them were committed the oracles (τὰ λόγια) of God" (Rom. 3:2), or when Philo, using the common expression of the LXX for Jehovah's commandments (Dt. 33:9; Ps. 119:67, 158) calls the Ten Words (*debarim*) uttered from Sinai the "Deca-logue" (τὰ δέκα λόγια).

Utterances of Jesus are still, during the New Testament period, referred to simply as "words" or "sayings" (λόγοι), as when Paul in I Thess. 4:15 refers to an utterance of Jesus (probably through the mouth of some church "prophet") as a "word (λόγος) of the Lord," or in Acts 20:35 is reported to have reminded his hearers of the "words (λόγοι) of the Lord Jesus." The pseudo-Pauline writer of the Pastoral Epistles, on the threshold of the second century, can refer to actual collections of such "health-giving words" (λόγοι). He even makes them his standard of orthodoxy in I Tim. 6:3, where they are explicitly defined to be "the words (λόγοι) of our Lord Jesus Christ." Clement of Rome, at about the same date (*c.* 95) still uses the same formula as the author of Acts in reminding his readers of "the words (λόγοι) of the Lord Jesus." Even as late as the Oxyrhynchus Papyrus (200 A.D.) collections of such "life-giving (?) words (λόγοι) of Jesus the living Lord" were still in circulation under the older and simpler designation.

The change to a more reverential designation comes soon after the turn of the century, coincidently with the use of written gospels and the disposition to treat the teaching of Jesus as a kind of "new Law" overriding the written commandment of Moses. His utterances are now classed with Old Testament Scripture as "oracles" (λόγια). The Epistle of James, Pseudo-Barnabas and the Gospel of Mt are salient examples of this neo-legalism, which inevitably tends to place

the utterances of Jesus alongside of the sacred "oracles" (λόγια) of the Old Testament, though of course on a higher plane. A typical instance is found in Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho*, 18, where the Jew is expressly said to have read the teaching of Jesus. In the previous chapter (17) Justin had coupled what he describes as "oracles (λόγια) of our Saviour" with some from the Old Testament. The passages in question are the four "Woes" of Is. 5:18, 20, to which Justin attaches Jesus' denunciation of the priests in Mt. 21:13, and his Woes against the Scribes and Pharisees, in a memoriter abstract of Mt. 23 blended with Lk. 11. Trypho having admitted that he had "read the doctrines taught" by Jesus, Justin thinks it permissible on his part to add these "oracles" (λόγια) of the Saviour to those of "the prophets."

We are thus brought to the precise period of Papias, concerning the meaning of whose use of the term τὰ λόγια dispute has recently been raised in high quarters. In our text it has been pointed out that Papias stands in the direct line of succession from Polycarp to Irenaeus. He is battling against those whom Polycarp had denounced as "perverting the oracles of the Lord (τὰ λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου) to their own lusts" and whom Irenaeus, depending on both Polycarp and Papias, arraigns as "bad interpreters of things well said." Polycarp uses the expression in *ad Phil.* vii. Irenaeus uses both λόγια κυριακά (exactly as in Papias' title) and the equivalent λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου in *Haer.* I, i. and I, viii. 1. It is difficult to imagine that the author of a book having the title "Interpretation (or 'Interpretations') of the Oracles of the Lord" [Λογίων Κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεως (*al.* = εων) έ] at the period of Justin, and with the objects in view represented by Polycarp and Irenaeus, could have meant by it anything else than what Polycarp, Justin, and Irenaeus, mean by the same term.

Two misapprehensions, however, require to be removed, one a comparatively slight misinterpretation but vastly misleading in its results, the other going widely astray from the meaning inferable from the parallels just cited, but as yet affecting but very few critics.

1. The first of these two misunderstandings is that which takes τὰ λόγια in Papias' statement that "Matthew made a compend of the oracles" (συνετάξατο [1] τὰ λόγια) to be the title of a book instead of the description of a book by its contents. This misunderstanding was the fundamental and prolific error of Schleiermacher, highly seductive to critics who denied the apostolic origin of our first Gospel, because it permitted the supposition that either Papias himself, or at least some authority such as the Elder John, on whom Papias might be conjectured to be resting, was referring to some other composition

[1] This reading is to be preferred to the synonymous variant συνεγράψατο, because of its agreement with the term employed by Papias in referring to Peter's part. "Peter had no design of making a compend (σύνταξιν) of the logia."

than the canonical work. If so there would be at least a hint of knowledge from remotest antiquity of that "Second Source" which modern critics are certainly able to trace behind our Gospels of Mt and Lk.

Schleiermacher's theory was tempting, but untenable. It was refuted by Hilgenfeld as early as the middle of the nineteenth century from the point of view of the radical Tübingen critics, and still more thoroughly by the extreme conservative Zahn in his *Introduction* (1897, Engl. 1909, section 54). In all countries save those of English speech the foremost critics have shown its fallacious nature. The history of the delusion has been briefly traced by the present writer in an article entitled "Why 'according to Matthew'?" (*Expositor*, 1920), and need not be here rehearsed. The error begins with Lightfoot's rejection of Hilgenfeld's correct interpretation of Papias' language, and ends with the habitual reference by English and American scholars and critics to "the Logia spoken of by Papias," where "the Logia" is assumed to be the title (or at least the description) of a book *not* to be identified with our first canonical Gospel.

The correct interpretation of Papias' language, an interpretation to which Lightfoot objected, is stated by Lightfoot himself as follows:

> Hilgenfeld, while applying it (the expression συνετάξατο τὰ λόγια) to our first Gospel, explains it on grounds which at all events are perfectly tenable. He supposes that Papias mentions only the *sayings* of Christ, not because St. Matthew recorded nothing else, but because he himself was concerned only with these, and St. Matthew's Gospel, as distinguished from St. Mark's, was the greatest storehouse of materials for his purpose.

It is certain that Papias was actually referring to our own Gospel of Mt, partly because in 140 A.D., or even earlier, no other "compend of the λόγια" could possibly be considered by any orthodox church writer as a standard reference book for the purpose described, partly because every one of the great number of ancient writers who based their statements concerning gospel origins on Papias understood it in this sense. This reference of Papias to our own Mt is so obvious and undeniable that those who continued for a time to cling to Schleiermacher's theory usually sought to avoid the difficulty by maintaining (without any basis whatever in the text) that the tradition was only quoted by Papias from "the Elder John" or some other remote witness, and that while *Papias himself* must be admitted to have our own Gospel of Mt in view, his *predecessor* meant some other writing, either a Proto-Mt, or some other source no longer extant.

The truth is that while Papias undoubtedly has our own Gospel of Mt in view, and no other document whatever, he is not referring to it by title, which then as now was simply Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθαῖον,

but describing it by that salient feature which chiefly concerned himself and his readers. It really was *the* compend (*σύνταξις*) of the Lord's oracles (*τὰ κυριακὰ λόγια*) *par eminence.*

The task of fighting with supposititious writings, no longer extant, but variable according to the inventor's requirements, is a kind of shadow-boxing incapable of yielding worth-while results. Nevertheless it should be apparent that testimony to a writing from the hand of an Apostle, whatever the nature of the *λόγια* supposed to have been compiled by him, could not easily disappear in the age of Clement of Rome and Ignatius, to whom words of Apostles have almost superhuman authority. The only element of the supposed tradition which gives it special value in the critic's eyes is its mention of the Apostle Matthew. Yet it is precisely this feature which we are compelled to renounce in attempting to go behind the statement of Papias. So difficult is it to imagine the transfer of the apostolic name to a later composition, followed by the entire disappearance of the original from the memory of the Church, that Godet, a firm believer in the existence of a writing called "The Logia," prefers, as we have noted, to assume that its true author was "not *an* Apostle, but the apostolate" (*Introd. to N. T.*, Pt. II, Four Gospels, Engl. 1899, p. 218.). How Luke, acquainted as he was with this apostolic document, could have so completely ignored its pre-eminent authority in his famous preface (Lk 1:1 f.) remains unexplained.

The truth is no other writing than the Old Testament could possibly circulate as *τὰ Λόγια* among churches accustomed to speak of the divine utterances of the Law and the Prophets as "the *λόγια*," or "the *λόγια* of God." Even to describe any writing other than this as "The Logia" would necessitate some distinguishing adjective to make known what particular sacred oracles were meant. In the title of Papias' *Interpretations* this is made clear by the adjective "dominical" (*κυριακά*). These "health-giving words" of the Lord Jesus are the "commandments" (*ἐντολαί*), greater than those of Moses, which had been "delivered by the Lord to the faith." These are *τὰ κυριακὰ λόγια.* Irenaeus meets the same necessity, without wholly removing ambiguity, by describing them as "oracles (*λόγια*) of the Lord" (*τοῦ Κυρίου*). Justin explicitly distinguishes them from utterances of the Old Testament prophets, by calling them "oracles of our Saviour."

It is therefore certain that Papias did not make his statement that "Matthew compiled (or composed) the logia" without some indication from the context what logia were meant. The briefer form, without the distinguishing adjective *Κυριακά*, was proper because Papias had made his meaning clear in no less than three different ways: (1) by his reference to the "commandments *given by the Lord* to the

faith," whose true sense could be determined by the tradition of "disciples of the Lord" specified by name; (2) by his explanation of the defective order of Mk on the ground that Mark had not himself been a follower of "the Lord," and that Peter, whose discourses Mark had later been privileged to hear, "had no design of making a compend (*σύνταξις*) of *the Lord's oracles*," (or "sayings"); (3) by the very title of his book, "Interpretation(s) of *the Lord's* oracles." As Schmiedel points out in his well known article "Gospels" in *EB*, vol. II, col. 1811 the use of the adjective *κυριακός* as in Irenaeus I, viii. 1 rather than the genitive as in Polycarp (*τοῦ Κυρίου*), or Justin's "oracles of our Saviour," was dictated by the necessity of avoiding ambiguity and prolixity.

> Papias calls them **Κυριακά** rather than **Κυρίου**, for obvious reasons. **Κύριος** is distinguished from **ὁ Κύριος**, in that the former often means "God," whilst the latter means "the Lord (Jesus)." **Λογίων Κυρίου** (**ἐξηγήσεως**) might have meant "Oracles of God," that is, the Old Testament (as in Irenaeus, Pref. I). **Τῶν Λογίων τοῦ Κυρίου ἑ** would be clear, but lengthy. **Κυριακός**, being applied to the Lord's day as distinct from the Sabbath, was exactly the fit word to distinguish the Law of Christ from the oracles of the Law of Moses.

We must also be on our guard against a further misinterpretation for which it must be admitted Lightfoot himself is directly responsible. Against the perfectly correct statement of Hilgenfeld that Papias by his expression *τὰ λόγια* referred not to any book or narrative whatever, but simply to "the sayings of Christ," whose meaning was the subject of discussion in Papias' time and of his own book in particular, Lightfoot proposed to take the expression as equivalent to "the Gospel," offering for this no better evidence than the application of the term to the entire four-gospel canon by a sixth-century (!) writer.

Such a sense for the term *τὰ λόγια* is without example for centuries after Papias. On the other hand we have already adduced repeated instances from his own time of the application of the term *λόγια* to divine utterances in general, and (where the context makes clear whose divine utterances are meant) the cherished sayings of Jesus. The expression "the oracles" in what Papias says regarding the work of Matthew is to be understood by what he says regarding the different service of Peter. The unsystematic collection of stories, some of them "doings," some "sayings," recorded by Mark in his Memorabilia (*ἀπομνημονεύματα*), owes its defects (to Papias' mind) to this fact among others, that Peter had no such design as that whose carrying out is ascribed to Matthew. Peter did not aim to provide an ordered compilation of "the sacred oracles." Matthew did so. The sacred oracles (or "sayings") are open to no possible doubt in the

reference to Peter's preaching. The use of the article alone would prove that they are the same spoken of in the title of the book as "dominical" (Κυριακά) and referred to as "commandments delivered by the Lord" in an adjacent passage. They are what Justin contemporarily refers to in distinction from the inspired utterances of Old Testament prophets as "the oracles of our Saviour." The expression "the oracles" is not equivalent to "the Gospel of Mt," for neither Papias nor Justin restrict their citations to this single Gospel. Both use Mt as the pre-eminent "compend" (σύνταξις) of them, but neither they, *nor* any contemporaries, Jewish or Christian, employ τὰ λόγια as the title of a book. Papias, then, is certainly misinterpreted when it is maintained, whether by Lightfoot or his many distinguished followers, that in speaking of the literary work of the apostle Matthew he has anything else in mind than our own canonical first Gospel, described from the then most valued factor of its contents. It was indeed "the greatest storehouse of materials for his purpose." To Papias, then, as to us, the First Gospel was "The Gospel according to Matthew," its main *contents*, compiled (συνέταξε) by the Apostle, were τὰ λόγια.

2. Scholars fully aware of the distinction between λόγοι and λόγια have recently propounded a new theory giving to the latter term its proper sense of "divine" or "inspired oracle," to Jews and Christians, more especially utterances of Moses and the prophets. The theory is most fully stated and most learnedly advocated by Dr. Rendel Harris in two successive volumes entitled *Testimonies*, Vol. I bearing date 1916, Vol. II, 1920. The effort is to trace back to the earliest times the use of collections of messianic proof-texts from the Old Testament such as Justin Martyr shows some evidence of employing, and later writers such as Cyprian actually published under the title *Testimonia*. Incidentally Dr. Harris and his coadjutor Dr. Vacher Burch endeavor to show that the expression τὰ λόγια employed by Papias has reference to such a collection of messianic proof-texts against the Jews, and not at all, as readers of Papias for some eighteen centuries have supposed, to the divinely inspired utterances of Jesus.

The objection to such a theory is not what its advocates assume. Dr. Harris may prove to his own satisfaction and that of his many interested readers, that such a collection of "testimonies" was used by Paul in Romans and Galatians (Chh. II and III), in Ephesians and Hebrews (Chh. IV and V), in the Gospels and Acts (Chh. VI–IX) and in Apocryphal writings (Ch. X). The proof will have no bearing on the point here at issue. It would still have none were he even to prove that Papias himself was acquainted with such collections of proof-texts and used them. To have any present bearing evidence must be adduced that in the particular passages in which

Papias uses the definite article τά, whose meaning must be determined by the context, Papias was speaking of such a collection, and not of utterances of Jesus, as all his readers have invariably supposed from Irenaeus down to the appearance of the anonymous essay *The Oracles ascribed to Matthew by Papias of Hierapolis* (1894).

Much aid and comfort is drawn by Dr. Bindley and some other of Dr. Harris' allies from the misuse we have already spoken of, made by English scholars in general and by several on the Continent of Europe, of the passage of Papias in which he speaks of Matthew's compilation of τὰ λόγια as though the term could be used as the title of a book, and applied either to the Gospel according to Mt, or some kind or other of proto-Mt. It cannot be so used. Only the context can determine what particular "divine oracles" were meant. The issue concerns the definite article τά. To what does it refer? The men who held Papias' work in their hands, not moderns who have only fragments, are those whose opinion is of value on this point. Needless to say, on this issue it is absolutely unanimous against Dr. Harris, Professor Burkitt, Dr. E. S. Selwyn, Dr. Solomon Reinach, and their associates.

All without exception from the second century down to the fifteenth who could know the actual work of Papias in unmutilated form understood him, when speaking of the compilation (σύνταξις) of "the" logia composed by Matthew in Hebrew, to mean our present Gospel according to Mt in its (assumed) original Semitic dress. No witnesses whatever, save moderns restricted to a few fragments quoted by Eusebius, witnesses anxious to unearth evidence for a critical discovery of their own of the Q source or some other unknown document, have ever found in Papias' declaration any other application.

Curiously it is in Dr. Harris' own *Testimonies* (Pt. II, pp. 5 ff.) that we find one of the best possible summaries of the various directions in which "investigators have been led astray by their desire to connect Papias with the traditional Hebrew original of the Gospel of Matthew," or (let us add, in order to include Dr. Harris' own theory) *some other conjectural document.* Dr. Harris lists under a, b, c, and d the "erroneous" types of "unverifiable hypotheses" to which this desire has led. We will transcribe his list with brief comment attached to each.

(a) Papias' *Oracles* are the Gospel of Matthew, the Hebrew original of our extant Gospel.

False, because Papias is not giving the title of a book, but describing it by its salient contents.

(b) Papias' *Oracles* are a collection of Aramaic Sayings of Jesus underlying our existing Gospel.

False, because not one of Papias' contemporaries betrays a suspi-

cion of the existence of such a collection, while all who actually used his book understood him to be referring to our Mt, the standard thesaurus of κυριακὰ λόγια of his time.

(c) Papias' *Oracles* are the source (Q) which underlies the common sections of Mt and Lk.

False, for reasons stated under (b).

(d) Papias' *Oracles* are a collection of fulfilments of prophecy, such as we find in the Gospel of Mt.

False, for reasons equally applicable to Dr. Harris' own theory, from which it is almost indistinguishable. The reasons are so well stated by Canon Stanton in the passage excerpted by Dr. Harris with attempted refutation on pp. 9 f., that repetition should be needless. But see below.

All of these misinterpretations of "investigators led astray by their desire to connect Papias with" some kind of precanonical document rightly or wrongly presumed to have existed, including Dr. Harris' own "unverifiable hypothesis," exhibit one fault in common. They emphasize it by the use of capital letters and italic type for the word *Oracles*. This itself is a begging of the whole question, for as Canon Stanton well says in his answer to Burkitt above referred to,

> The use of τὰ λόγια as the description of a particular set of extracts from the Old Testament, when the whole Old Testament was commonly so called, would be too confusing to be thought of.

Dr. Harris' answer to this is enlightening though it should be accompanied by the explanation which we insert in parentheses:

> Papias does not use the article systematically before λόγια. He calls his work an "Exposition of Dominical oracles" (Greek book titles avoid the use of the article where possible). When he says, "Matthew wrote The Oracles," the article is demonstrative of the particular Oracles on which Papias comments.

But the clause συνετάξατο (*al.* συνεγράψατο) τὰ λόγια does not mean "wrote the Oracles." It means "*compiled* the oracles." The article τά, which Papias does not use indiscriminately before λόγια but only as required by the practice of good writers, *and as elucidated by the context*, tells exactly what "particular oracles" he was talking about, viz., the "dominical" (Κυριακά) oracles whose meaning was in dispute. Dr. Harris is able to believe, in spite of the context, and in spite of the unanimous understanding of antiquity, that these "particular oracles" were certain Old Testament extracts collected in a *Testimony Book!* He holds up to ridicule as a "shot a little wide of the target" the following statement of the case by one distinguished

above almost every Gospel critic of our time on account of the sobriety and careful precision of his statements, Sir John Hawkins in *Oxford Studies on the Synoptic Problem*, p. 105.

> One of these two sources (for the oracles to be expounded by Papias), *i.e.*, St. Mark's Gospel, contains, as Papias says, both sayings and doings of Christ, while the other, which he ascribes to St. Matthew, has as its main object sacred utterances (τὰ λόγια), which (with the article and in this connection) can only mean those of the Lord. . . . Does he mean, and did he expect his readers to understand, that St. Matthew's object in writing was narrower than St. Mark's, and that he designed only (see above "*main* object") to record sayings and discourses of Christ? Probably he did.

It should be admitted that even the guarded statement of Sir John Hawkins requires a shade of modification as indicated by the words we have added in parentheses. The matter is put too strongly when it is maintained that τὰ λόγια *in general* "can only mean those of the Lord." But only an opponent disposed to take the writer's meaning in an unintended sense could imagine it to be other than as defined by our parenthetic supplement. Again the word "only," spoken of Matthew's design, is too strong unless understood in the light of the preceding statement concerning the "main" object of Matthew. If applied to the Gospel of Mt as compared with the Gospel of Mk nothing could be more just or accurate than to say, as Papias does say, that its author's *main* design was to make a compilation (σύνταξιν) of the oracles of the Lord.

APPENDED NOTE III

THE ANTI-MARCIONITE PROLOGUES

Since the publication in 1921 of Harnack's great work on *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*, it has become doubly apparent that the appearance of Marcion's *Antitheses* at Rome c. 140 must be the starting point for all reliable accounts of the formation of the New Testament canon. The Church by this formidable attack upon the authenticity of its apostolic documents was placed upon the defensive and compelled to offset Marcion's New Testament, consisting of "the" Gospel (a garbled and mutilated Lk) and "the Apostle" (ten Epistles of Paul in similarly "corrected" form), with a "catholic" New Testament of its own. For this "canon" of approved books prologues were drawn up in imitation of the prologues with which Marcion had prefaced his own edition of the Scriptures (that is, his "Gospel" and "Apostle"), and these "Anti-Marcionite" Prologues to the Gospels have recently been brought into fuller light by the researches of D. Donatien DeBruyne, who collates their text from Mss of the Vulgate which contain survivals from the Old Latin and discusses their origin in an able and instructive article in *Revue Bénédictine* XL, 3 (July, 1928) entitled "Les plus anciens prologues latins des évangiles."

Unfortunately the Anti-Marcionite prologue to Mt has not survived, but the remaining three prologues have very great importance for the entire problem of the formation of the four-Gospel canon. In particular that prefixed to the fourth Gospel has long been a subject of keen debate among critics, including two articles by the present writer. My former conclusions must therefore now be either justified or withdrawn, inasmuch as they are vigorously assailed by DeBruyne. The articles referred to were published in *JBL*, XXXII, 3 (Sept., 1913) under the title "The Latin Prologues of John" and in *JThS*, XXIII, 90 (Jan., 1922) under the title "Marcion, Papias and 'The Elders'." These are hereinafter designated Art. I and Art. II respectively.

Thanks to DeBruyne the long debated prologue to Jn can now be printed in a reliable text based on seven previously unknown Mss. It appears with *apparatus criticus* on p. 198 f. of his article as follows.

> Euangelium iohannis manifestatum et datum est ecclesiis ab iohanne adhuc in corpore constituto, sicut papias nomine hierapolitanus, discipulus iohannis carus, in exotericis, id est in extremis quinque libris retulit. De-

scripsit vero evangelium dictante iohanne recte. Verum Marcion hereticus, cum ab eo fuisset inprobatus eo quod contraria sentiebat, abiectus est ab iohanne. Is vero scripta uel epistulas ad eum pertulerat a fratribus qui in ponto fuerunt.

This text coincides with that of my Art. I in all particulars save punctuation. Agreeing with earlier critics as to the diverse origin of the latter half I punctuated with a full stop after *dictante iohanne.* Thus divided the prologue may be rendered:

A. The Gospel of John was revealed and given to the churches by John while yet in the body, as one Papias of Hierapolis, a dear disciple of John, has reported in his exoteric, that is, his last five books. Indeed he took down the Gospel in writing while John dictated.

B. Marcion the heretic, however, who had been disapproved by him (?) because of his adverse opinions, was (justly?) cast out by John. Indeed he (Marcion) had brought to him (John) writings, or letters, from the brethren who dwelt in Pontus.

Paragraph A must be first considered.

In his able volume *Die Enstehung des Johannesevangeliums* (1912), Prof. Carl Clemen could still maintain (p. 375) that the statement of this unknown author, whose language proves him to be translating from an earlier Greek document, at least in Paragraph A, should be accepted as reporting in substance the actual fact.

Not, of course, that the alleged testimony of Papias could be admitted in the form reported. Lightfoot in his Essays against the author of *Supernatural Religion* (*Contemporary Review*, 1875, XXVI, 854) had conceded this to be incredible, proposing instead

that Papias, having reported some saying of St. John on the authority of the elders, went on somewhat as follows: " and this accords with what we find in his own Gospel, which he gave to the churches when he was still in the body " . . .

Thus altered to a mere *obiter dictum* Lightfoot believed the testimony might have escaped the notice of the contestants over the question of the authenticity of Jn, who ransacked the pages of Papias for evidence on this question, *pro* and *contra*, from 180 to 300 A.D. Indeed we should add to this third-century inspection the careful search of Eusebius, who, early in the fourth century, again scrutinized Papias' five-chaptered work for evidence on the origin of the Gospels. In view of this repeated scrutiny, affording no trace of the alleged testimony we need not be surprised to find even Lightfoot disinclined to attach importance to the alleged fragment, even in the form conjecturally restored by himself. Clemen was disposed to give it more weight. Others still remain dubious.

In Art. I I argued that those critics are right (Clemen included) who maintain that the Prologue (sustained by some later evidence) actually does reflect in distorted form a statement made by Papias in the fifth and last book of his *Exegeses* (corrupted in the Prologue to *in exotericis, id est in extremis quinque libris*) but with different application. For a part of the blundering in Paragraph A, for example the attempted correction of *exotericis* by adding *id est*, etc., the translator may reasonably be held responsible. But the Greek writer himself can have had no direct acquaintance with the work cited. He draws from someone (Hippolytus?) who had made reference to "the fifth book of the *Exegeses* of Papias." In my article it was shown that the statement could be accepted if the testimony cited had applied originally to the *Revelation*, not the *Gospel* of Jn. For Papias' fifth book dealt with eschatology, as the citations of Irenaeus prove. The Prologue-writer could easily take Papias' testimony to the Revelation as applicable to the Gospel also.

The reasons given for this explanation were chiefly the following:

(1) We are credibly informed by Andreas of Caesarea, who elsewhere professes to quote "word for word" from Papias' book, that "Papias," as well as "Irenaeus, Methodius *and Hippolytus*" maintained the "credibility" (*τὸ ἀξιόπιστον*) of Revelation. Corroboration is available. Justin Martyr, who does not actually quote Papias but probably rests on his authority, asserts (*Dial.* lxxxi) that

> John, one of the apostles of Christ, prophesied by a revelation that was made to him that those who believe in our Christ would dwell a thousand years in Jerusalem.

In short Justin agrees with his Phrygian contemporary in observing a silence regarding the authorship of the anonymous Gospel and Epistles and a relative neglect of their testimony which are hard to reconcile with the idea that their authenticity had as yet come into dispute, at the same time that he ardently champions the claim of the Revelation to have been "revealed to John in the Spirit."

Again this "revelation in the Spirit" was accompanied by the direction (Rev. 1:11) to "write the vision in a book" and "give it to the churches." This, clearly, is the statement which Papias thought "worthy of belief"; for as yet dispute had not arisen over the apostolic authorship of the anonymous Gospel and Epistles, whereas the question whether the claim of Rev. 1:9–11 was or was not "worthy of belief" formed the very heart of the prolonged chiliastic controversy. A testimony of Papias to the *Revelation* of John is a well-attested fact; a testimony from him to the *Gospel* is admittedly incredible, at least in the form alleged.

(2) The phraseology quoted by the Prologue, *manifestatum* (!)

et datum ecclesiis, applies to a "revelation" rather than a gospel. Moreover it agrees exactly with that of Rev. 1:9–11 "I John . . . was in the Spirit, and I heard a great voice saying, *what thou seest write in a book and send it to the seven churches.*" The same phraseology reappears, as we have seen, in Justin ("prophesied by a revelation made to him"), it also appears in a *subscription* to Revelation which may be rendered from the Ethiopic:

> Here is ended the vision of John, the Apocalypse, Amen. That is to say, *that vision which he saw in his lifetime;* and it was written by the blessed John the evangelist of God.[1]

The Prologue merely reiterates this. When it also states that the command received by John "in the Spirit" was carried out "while he was yet in the body" it makes no further inference than every reader of Rev. 1:9–11 necessarily makes and was intended to make. The accepted date for the publication of the Apocalypse ("in the end of the reign of Domitian") made the statement necessary because publication at the age of ninety and upwards was not more common in antiquity than today.

(3) In the age of Tertullian and Hippolytus the *Instrumentum-Johanneum* was a unit. For the Church at large all five of the disputed books stood or fell together. Hence if testimony from Papias were lacking in behalf of the Gospel (and we have seen that none is likely to have been available) his testimony to the Revelation could be made to serve as well. If a Hippolytus in defending the authenticity of the Revelation against Gaius quoted Melito, Irenaeus, or Methodius to this effect; or if in his treatise *Against Marcion* he spoke of Papias as having borne this witness to the "credibility" of Rev. 1:9–11, the statement would easily be construed by the writer of any contemporary Prologue to be applicable to the whole *Instrumentum Johanneum.*

Fortunately or unfortunately Paragraph A of the Prologue giving the testimony of Papias does not stand alone. The supplement in Paragraph B stands by general consent on a lower level of credibility. Westcott and Lightfoot ascribed to it a separate origin. Zahn dismisses it as "wholly fabulous." But to locate and date Paragraph A we must also consider Paragraph B, considering first the point of division.

DeBruyne, to whose able article we must presently give attention, declares that to punctuate by a full stop after *dictante iohanne,* joining *recte* to Paragraph B, is contrary to "the Mss., grammar, and good

[1] Tischendorf renders in a manner to make the reference to 1:9–11 still more unmistakable: Quod est dictum (Rev. 1:9–11): quam vidit in vita sua visio, et scripta fuit, etc.

sense." The *apparatus criticus* on p. 199 shows only that a group of four Mss. among the ten which give the text (a group which includes the oldest and best of all) omits *recte* entirely, ending Paragraph A: *qui hoc evangelium, iohanne sibi dictante, conscripsit.* Mss. TXEY begin a new paragraph with *Verum Marcion,* for in the form *verum* this conjunction always stands first in the sentence. Before turning to the consideration of Paragraph B we note, then, that so far as Paragraph A is concerned punctuation with a full stop after *descripsit dictante iohanne* (or *dict. ioh. conscripsit*) is certainly not contrary to the Mss. It is also not contrary to good sense. Quite the opposite. DeBryune (p. 200 f.) offers among other convincing proofs of common authorship for the three surviving prologues their limitation to a common outline. This mentions (1) the writer's name and identity; (2) the place of writing; (3) the transmission; that is, how the record was obtained, the three facts most essential to authentication. Only the prologue to Lk-Acts, the Gospel writing particularly in dispute, is considerably expanded to refute the claims of Marcion. The closing phrase of all three prologues is noticeably similar. For Mk we have: *Post excessionem ipsius Petri descripsit idem hoc in partibus Italiae evangelium.* For Lk: *In Achaiae partibus hoc descripsit evangelium.* Punctuating as we have proposed Paragraph A of the prologue to Jn ends (the churches of Asia having been previously referred to): *Descripsit vero evangelium dictante Iohanne.*

Postponing momentarily the vexed question of the adverb *recte* and its proper place in the context we turn, then, to Paragraph B and its curious statements about Marcion and John. Its anachronistic report of the Apostle John excommunicating the heretic no doubt appears grotesque enough. But to reject the paragraph as "wholly fabulous" is not the right procedure, because the statement is traceable to certain utterances of Tertullian adduced in Arts. I and II. These not only explain the statement but prove thus that the date of Paragraph B is not earlier than 208 A.D., when Tertullian wrote his five books "Against Marcion" (*Adv. Marcionem* I, i. 15). To prove this against DeBruyne, who peremptorily denies this dependence (p. 210, "contre Bacon je rejette toute dépendance vis à vis de Tertullien") it will be necessary to repeat some of the extracts given on p. 209 of Art. I, and thereafter to consider the testimony of the Mss.

1. To elucidate the clause of Paragraph B *Is vero scripta vel epistolas ad eum pertulerat a fratribus qui in Ponto fuerunt* the following passage was cited from Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* IV, iii f.:

> Sed enim Marcion *nactus epistulam* (*sc.* Gal. marc.) . . . connititur ad destruendum statum eorum evangeliorum quae propria et sub apostolorum nomine (*i.e.*, Jn and Mt) eduntur . . . et pecuniam in primo calore fidei

> catholicae ecclesiae contulit, *projectam mox cum ipso*, postquam in haeresim . . . descivit. Quid nunc si negaverint Marcionitae primam apud nos fidem eius adversus *epistulam ipsius?* Quid si nec *epistulam* agnoverint.

Like modern interpreters the Prologue-writer seems a little in doubt as to the nature of Marcion's "letter," which he refers to as *scripta* vel *epistulas*. His decision coincides with DeBruyne's that it was a letter of commendation from the brethren in Marcion's native province of Pontus. Other interpreters of high standing think Tertullian is referring to an epistle falsely ascribed to Marcion himself. As regards the question of dependence the uncertainty indicated by the *vel epistulas* is of some importance. As regards the "casting out" (*projectam mox cum ipso*) it can of course be still maintained with Harnack and DeBruyne, in spite of certain obvious difficulties, that the Prologue-writer was not dependent upon Tertullian, but had the story by separate tradition.

2. We turn then to the curious statement that Marcion was cast out by John [*abiectus est ab iohanne* (!)]. As to this and the equally curious mildness of the alleged offense (*eo quod contraria sentiebat*) two questions were raised in my articles (II, p. 210): (*a*) How comes the discomfiture of Marcion to be attributed to *John?* (*b*) Why is his heresy referred to in terms which would almost justify a charge of bigotry and intolerance on the part of the Apostle?

Both questions can at once be answered by dependence on Tertullian, and can be answered (so far as the present writer can see) in no other way.

(*a*) It is Tertullian who in several passages makes witty and telling reference to the fact that the Apostle John had anticipated the rejection of his own writings by Marcion in the passage from II Jn 7 (paralleled by I Jn 4:2 f.), where the docetic heresy proclaimed by the disturber of the faith is emphatically denounced as follows:

> Many deceivers are gone forth into the world, even they that confess not that Jesus Christ cometh in the flesh. This is the deceiver and the antichrist.

The application of the passage to Marcion is not original with Tertullian. Indeed Irenaeus relates it as applied by Polycarp to Marcion face to face in Rome (*Haer.* III, iii. 4); Eusebius (*HE* III, xxviii. 6) tells it of John and Cerinthus. We may infer from *HE*, III, xxxix. 16 (Papias "uses testimonies from the first Epistle of John") that Papias himself employed it against docetists. Jerome (Hieron. Prol. to Mt) says explicitly that "John *in his Epistle* denounces as antichrists those who "deny that Christ is come in the flesh" applying it, however, to "Cerinthus and Ebion," supposed contemporaries of John. Whoever be first credited with the application Tertullian repeatedly

adverts to the condemnation of Marcion by John (in this prophetic sense). The passages cited in Arts. I and II were *Adv. Marc.* III, viii; *Praescr.* xxxiii, and *Adv. Praxeam*, xxviii. For the curious inversion of the parts, making John cast out Marcion in advance of Marcion's rejection of "John" we must therefore hold Tertullian primarily responsible. Tertullian, of course, is speaking of John's prophetic "confounding" (*confudiset*) and "casting out" (*projectam*) of the heretic who in after years would "labor to destroy the standing of those Gospels which appear under the actual names of Apostles." The Prologue-writer changes prophecy into fact.

(*b*) The second question was: Why is the offence charged described so mildly as *eo quod contraria sentiebat?* This also was answered by reference to Tertullian, who voices the habitual (and just) complaint of the many writers "Against Marcion" that he had arbitrarily removed from his text whatever was "contrary to his own opinion." This reproach is addressed to Marcion by Tertullian as follows in *De Carne Christi*, iii:

> If thou hadst not rejected the Scriptures which were contrary to thine own opinion (opinionae tuae resistentes) the Gospel of John would have confounded thee.

In *Adv. Marc.* IV, vi, he writes:

> He (Marcion) has erased everything that was *contrary to his own opinion*, whilst everything that *agreed with his own opinion* he has retained (contraria quaeque sententiae suae erasit . . . competentia autem sententiae suae reservavit).

These proofs of dependence by the Prologue-writer on Tertullian appear to have escaped the attention of Harnack, who in his *Neue Studien zu Marcion* (1923) does not include among the reviews of his important volume any reference to Art. II. Instead he resorts to the critical knife to rid himself of the inconvenient words *ab iohanne* in Paragraph B in a note on p. 30 as follows:

> It now seems to me very probable that in the Prologue to Jn (on this see DeBruyne, *Rev. Bénéd.* 1921, Oct. p. 14) the *a Iohanne* at the close should be stricken out as an interpolation (*cf.* Jer. *De Vir. Ill.* 7 with Ter. *De Bapt.* 17). In that case it is Papias who rejected Marcion as a heretic after the latter had brought him letters (of commendation) from the brethren in Pontus. This statement is not incredible.

This conjecture is adopted and defended by DeBruyne, as we shall see; not, however, in ignorance of my attempt to show the true origin of the strange assertion, but with the peremptory denial already quoted of any "dependence on Tertullian" whatever.

DeBruyne's article of 1928 has already been described. It was

properly received with unstinted praise in Harnack's extended review in *Sitzungsberichte der Preuss. Akad.* of Oct., 1928; for it has high scientific value quite apart from the fact that it concludes with the explicit avowal of an intention to support the views of Harnack regarding New Testament origins, and especially cites with approval the passage just quoted from *Neue Studien*. If, therefore, the idea of a casting out of Marcion by "the elders" at Ephesus previous to the well known occurrence at Rome, is a misleading and completely unfounded theory (as the present writer maintains) it will be necessary, with all due acknowledgment of error, to undertake an answer.

For two reasons an answer to DeBruyne can only be undertaken in a spirit of genuine humility. First, because he is an experienced student of Church History, who in this most recent contribution has proved his energy and industry by unearthing a long list of Latin Mss. inaccessible to scholars *in partibus infidelium*, and by collating from them the text of a group, very early in date, of Anti-Marcionite Prologues to the four Gospels. He gives up as irremediably lost the Prologue to Mt, though one might hazard the hope that some traces may still be found to survive in the *Ecclesiastica Historia* and other material cited in Art. I. The Prologue to Lk-Acts is still extant *in the original Greek*, those to Mk and Jn survive only in Latin translation. The world of New Testament scholarship is greatly indebted to DeBruyne for the patient search of years, now rewarded by the discovery of these early formulations against Marcion by the Church catholic of its own version of the origin of the canonical writings; also for the skill with which he has firmly established certain earlier surmises as to a Greek original of these long imperfectly known "Latin Prologues," located this Greek original at Rome "during the period when Greek was still the language of the Roman church," and proved that the three surviving prologues formed originally a consistent group, produced by a single writer at a given date to meet a single definite purpose. Not least must we thank him for a demonstration from the phenomena of dissemination that the Latin translation of these prologues emanates from North Africa, the home of Tertullian, but a few decades after Tertullian's death. DeBruyne's entire exposition is given with admirable lucidity, extreme conciseness and accurate reference. What scholar will venture to criticize it without sincere acknowledgment?

Secondly, the present writer stands in the position of the inexpert lawyer who by reason of his own technical blunder has seen his good case thrown out of court, and to obtain a further hearing must submit an amended plea.

The proposal to divide Paragraph A from Paragraph B by beginning Paragraph B *Recte ver*um ignores the distinction between *ver*um and

vero. The post-positive form of the conjunction is vero. The proposed punctuation requires the form *Recte vero:* DeBruyne insists (rightly in our judgment) on retaining *recte*. It is easier to account for its cancellation before *verum* than to explain it away as an interpolation. Acknowledging the error we ask leave to resubmit the plea in the form *Recte vero Marcion*.

But we shall be told *vero* is "contrary to the Mss." We venture still to maintain that the verdict of the Mss. is at least disputable, and that "good sense" positively requires the punctuation and reading now proposed. The apparatus criticus gives the following:

> 9 descr. –recte qui hoc evangelium, iohanne sibi dictante (dict. sibi EY subdictante T), conscripsit TXEY 10 archinon T.

The bearing of this witness is two-fold. It concerns (1) the ending of Paragraph A; (2) the occurrence of one *m* or two after *veru* (*o*). We will take the two questions in order.

(1) It is apparent that the group of scribes represented by Mss. TXEY felt the incongruity of the word *recte* at the end of Paragraph A just as moderns do. For certainly we cannot adopt the ludicrous interpretation of Corssen that John dictated while standing "erect" (!); neither is it satisfactory to maintain with Harnack and DeBruyne that the Prologue-writer felt it needful to assure the reader that John dictated "correctly." The cancellation of this word by the important group TXEY, to say nothing of the modified close: *qui hoc evangelium, iohanne sibi* (*sc.* Papias) *dictante conscripsit*, shows beyond question that to the mind of these scribes the word *recte*, wherever it might belong, did *not* belong there.[2]

(2) The reason why *recte* is felt to be *de trop* by TXEY is undoubtedly because they read the next word as *ver*um. Since this form of the conjunction invariably begins the sentence *recte* had either to be dropped (so TXEY) or attached to the end of Paragraph A (so the other Mss.); because the name Marcion could not (in most cases) be mistaken. But the scribe of T (oldest of all the Mss.) *does* mistake it. He gives us the extraordinary form "Archinon" drawing the single *m* to the preceding word *verum*. In other words his eye (or ear) caught but one *m*, and this *m* he gave to the conjunction, whereas it really belonged to the noun. We may not be correct in holding that the doubling of the *m* in the later Mss. is merely due to dittography from the name "Marcion" which followed, but at least we may claim in this case also that to read *Recte vero Marcion*, etc., is not entirely without Ms. support.

Either of the foregoing alternatives allows of punctuation according to sense without being justly considered contrary either to grammar or

[2] Prochorus (*c.* 500), seems to have read *verum*. See Art. II, p. 149 f.

Mss. We may omit *recte* altogether with TXEY, beginning Paragraph B *Verum Marcion*, etc., or we may begin it *Recte vero Marcion*, cancelling one *m* on the evidence of T, and reading o for u. The latter course seems to me preferable because reduplication of *m* is more probable than interpolation of the word *recte*. One alternative or the other is really required by the sense.

The question of punctuation, and whether Paragraph A should end *descripsit . . . dictante Iohanne*, or *Iohanne sibi dictante conscripsit*, or even *descripsit . . . dictante Iohanne recte*, is subordinate. The question of real importance is whether Paragraph B is or is not dependent on Tertullian. On this issue DeBruyne must be heard *in extenso*. We will translate exactly the paragraph (p. 208) in which he states his conclusion:

> Let us pass to the story about Marcion, where the difficulties are so enormous that a remedy must be sought. The sentence as received means that Marcion was condemned by Papias for his errors, that he was afterward rejected, excommunicated by John. It was to John (*ad eum*) that the heretic had presented writings or letters (apparently letters of commendation), granted by the Christians of the province of Pontus. Obviously this cannot be historical. But where lies the difficulty? Which is the impossible word? I answer, *ab iohanne*. To begin with there are many *iohannes* in our prologue, five in five lines. That is too many. Next, Papias strikes me as a too emancipated disciple: in a grave matter of doctrine he does not consult his teacher, he takes the initiative and condemns, John merely follows the lead of his disciple. Then, the anachronism is violent; who can have imagined that John was still living in the period of Marcion? Finally our prologue was written at Rome; granting that in the West chronology was so defective that the Romans could actually believe that John had rejected Marcion, what interest had they to recall the condemnation pronounced by Papias? Alongside of John Papias was of no account and might as well vanish. That is why *ab iohanne* cannot be the true reading; it has been introduced mechanically, by a copyist or by the translator; after so many preceding *iohannes* it has displaced some other name, the name, I should surmise, of some Roman authority. In that case all is explained. According to Tertullian it was at Rome that Marcion presented his letters, and our prologue says the same thing, independently of Tertullian. Thus one can understand the mention of Papias: John was dead, Marcion was condemned in Asia by a disciple of John (correctly or incorrectly our author says by Papias). Finally, it seems to me wholly improbable that in a prologue written at Rome, there should be no mention of the issue to which the Marcionite conflict was brought at Rome: the controversy in Asia had been a mere skirmish, the decisive blow was struck at Rome.

DeBruyne's criticism of "the sentence as received," making Papias the antecedent of *ab eo*, is unanswerable. To make Papias, or any other "disciple of John in Asia," the hero of the encounter with Mar-

cion changes the whole thing into absurdity. DeBruyne will hear nothing of explanation by dependence on Tertullian ("Contre Bacon je rejette toute dépendance vis à vis de Tertullien"). "The difficulties are so enormous that remedy must be sought." His "remedy" is the best example since Marcion of removal from the text of "everything contrary to his own opinion." And even so the result is not attained. Cancel *ab iohanne* in the clause *abiectus est ab iohanne*, substitute for it "some Roman authority" and you still have the brethren in Pontus addressing letters of commendation to a "Roman authority" which Marcion nevertheless presents to a disciple of John "in Asia."

Every Ms., on DeBruyne's own showing, contains the obnoxious *ab iohanne*, without any variant whatever. The Marcionesque emendation, somewhat hesitatingly proposed by Harnack on p. 30 of his *Neue Studien zu Marcion* (1923), is seized upon with avidity by DeBruyne as an escape from the proof of dependence on Tertullian. Both originator and sponsor for the conjectural reading ignore the fact that Harnack himself, in his original discussion of the Prologue (p. 11), had pointed out that Philastrius (*Haer.* 45) not later than 384 A.D. already makes the same statement as the Prologue. Marcion, says Philastrius, came to Rome *devictus atque fugatus* A BEATO IOHANNE EVANGELISTA *et a presbuteris de civitate Efesi.*

The conventional addition *et a presbuteris* makes no difference with this decisive witness of Philastrius. The prologue read in 384 A.D. precisely as now. But to assume its statement to be historical (even substituting "Papias" for "John") is to maintain that the whole affair of Marcion's expulsion at Ephesus remained unknown at Rome, and that even the record of it escaped the attention of all the many writers "Against Marcion" from Justin to Hippolytus, well acquainted as they were with Papias, to crop up in a third century African prologue-writer ignorant even of the name of Papias' book. Whether this supposition be in accord with "good sense" must be left to the reader's judgment.

DeBruyne falls back upon "grammar." On p. 208 he tells us that "*ab eo* must (*doit*) refer to the subject of *descripsit*, that is to say Papias." We answer, Yes,—*if* the grammar be that of the classic Latinity of nineteenth-century scholars, and *if* Paragraph A and Paragraph B were originally a unit. Both suppositions are denied. DeBruyne holds "Bacon" responsible for the fact that the figurative language of Tertullian becomes "confused" (brouillé) in Paragraph B. But who is responsible for the ambiguities of the demonstrative *is* in the three remaining occurrences in the same paragraph after the first *ab eo*?[3]

[3] The substitution of *sibi* for *eo* in the variant above cited (TXEY iohanne *sibi* dictante) is very likely due to an attempt to remove the ambiguity complained of.

DeBruyne was doubtless deterred from any consideration of Art. I by his discovery of a regrettable grammatical error in Art. II. The fault therefore is my own. But if he had not been thus deterred he would have read on p. 209 reasons for doubting that "the Greek *argumentum* included the second, anti-Marcionite paragraph." Dependence on Tertullian would of course compel us to date both paragraphs "in the latter half of the third century," where DeBruyne reasonably places the Latin translation, if the whole prologue were a unit. But there is no need to bring down Paragraph A to this late date. It is true that even Paragraph A quotes Papias at second hand, perhaps through the medium of Hippolytus, and for this and other reasons must be dated later than the period of Melito of Sardis, where DeBruyne would place it. DeBruyne admits a probable relation to Irenaeus, but insists that the dependence is on Irenaeus' part (!). He considers it a sufficient answer to my citation of the clause *discipulus Johannis carus* to say "But Irenaeus does not quote this witness of Papias." Of course. What Irenaeus does allege (mistakenly, as Eusebius showed) is that Papias was "a hearer (*ἀκουστής*) of John" (*Haer.* V, xxxiii. 4; *cf.* Euseb. *H. E.* III, xxxix. 7). Had our Prologue-writer quoted Irenaeus exactly the question of priority might be disputable. The fact that he exaggerates in the direction of the Catena edited by Corderius,[4] to make Papias a "dear disciple" and the amanuensis of the Gospel, is clear proof that Irenaeus is the earlier and does *not* "depend on the prologue" (p. 206).

A date for the composition of the original *Greek* prologues at Rome in the period of Hippolytus is entirely probable. Paragraph A of the prologue to Jn may well contain a reminiscence (borrowed from Hippolytus' defense of the Johannine canon or some similar work, much as the Latin translator borrows in 250–300 from Tertullian) of Papias' testimony to the authenticity of the Apocalypse referred to by Andreas. Papias had no more to say about the authorship of the fourth Gospel than his contemporary Justin, and for the same reason. Claims of apostolic authorship for the anonymous Epistles and Gospel had not yet been *openly* made, or at least not officially endorsed. Johannine authorship is *suggested* in Jn 21:24, but the suggestion is purposely "veiled." Open affirmation would have invited the same violent denial which had greeted the affirmation of Rev. 1:9–11.

For the history of the canonization of the Gospels it is unfortunate that both the *Muratorianum* and the Anti-Marcionite Prologues should be defective as respects the first Gospel of the canon. In both cases we are obliged to resort to conjecture. However, conjecture is less likely to go astray in this case than in any other.

[4] Cited in Lightfoot-Harmer, *Apostolic Fathers* (1891), p. 524.

It is practically certain that the *Muratorianum* repeated in substance the statement of Papias. Mt was certainly counted "The first of the Gospels." In addition we can be sure its apostolic authorship was emphasized, because the statement made in regard to Luke *tamen nec ipse vidit* (*sc. dominum*) *in carne* distinctly implies a similar statement in regard to Mark as having not himself seen the Lord, but only reported faithfully what he had heard of the utterances of Peter (*quibus tamen interfuit et ita posuit*). Such a statement might be made regarding the second and third Gospels by a canon-maker of A.D. 180–250; but only on the supposition that he had first emphasized the universal conviction of all church writers of his time, the belief already implied in Papias, that in Mt could be found that complete and apostolic authority for the teaching of Jesus which was indispensable to the Church's own teaching. The *Muratorianum* comes from the same church as the Greek prologues, belongs to about the same period, and represents the same interest, for in its section devoted to the objectionable writings epistles "to the Laodiceans" (the Marcionite Ephesians which was thus entitled?), and "to the Alexandrians" (Hebrews?) are denounced as "falsely ascribed to Paul in the interest of Marcion's heresy" (*Pauli nomine finctae ad heresim Marcionis*). Thus the *Muratorianum* also is distinctly "Anti-Marcionite."

Whatever the measure of success which may attend future efforts to restore the Anti-Marcionite prologue to Mt we have at least this important indication of the opposition against which it was directed, that Tertullian in the passage already quoted from his treatise "Against Marcion" (*Adv. Marc.* IV, iii.) speaks of Marcion as "laboring to overthrow the standing of those Gospels which are specially ascribed by name to apostles" (*connititur ad destruendum statum eorum evangeliorum quae propria et sub apostolorum nomine eduntur*). This expression cannot be satisfied by any mere disregard on Marcion's part, or tacit ignoring, of Mt and Jn, the Gospels whose authors, as Tertullian says, "came first instilling faith, while Luke and Mark renew it afterward." Marcion must have directly assailed the church's claim to possess in these two Gospels authentic writings of the two apostles whose names they still bear. We may perhaps infer from our knowledge of controversy in Phrygia in 167 A.D. over the question whether "Matthew" was or was not in conflict with Jn as regards the date of the passion (*Pasch. Chron.* Fragt. of Claudius Apollinaris), and our further knowledge of opposition raised in the period of Cerinthus to admission of Mt with its Birth Epiphany to equal standing with the Roman Baptism-Epiphany Gospel of Mk (Irenaeus, *Haer.* III, xi. 7), that Marcion pursued in this assault upon the *status* of Mt and Jn his favorite method of alleging contradiction. The reason will then be apparent for the particularizing by the *Muratorianum* of the "nativ-

ity" and the "passion and resurrection" as features in which the alleged conflict is denied.

Whatever the particular nature of Marcion's assault it is important to observe that already *c.* 140 at Rome claims were being made for Johannine authorship of the fourth Gospel. These, however, had not as yet obtained official sanction, else the relative disregard of Jn by Justin would be inexplicable. From the moment of such official endorsement of the claim, giving Jn the *status* assailed by Marcion, the tendency so clearly manifested by Tertullian would become apparent to adopt the order Jn, Mt, or at least Mt, Jn, before Lk and Mk. The fourth place assigned to Jn by the *Muratorianum* confirms the other proofs of a relatively late date for its admission to equal standing with the Synoptics in the Roman canon.

Nevertheless, in Tertullian's reference to Marcion's assault upon its *status* we have evidence suggestive of a curious parallel between the acceptance of Mt at Rome but a few years after the arrival thither of Ignatius in spite of the protests of Adoptionists such as Cerinthus, and the acceptance there of Jn a few decades after the momentous visit of Polycarp. For Polycarp's visit implied consideration for the Ephesian Gospel on which the Asiatics rested their Quartodeciman Easter observance. In spite of the vehement resistance of Caius and the Alogi, we find after a few decades the Ephesian Gospel accepted in Rome to equal standing with the Synoptics. In the case of Mt it was the Adoptionism of Mk which offered resistance to the newcomer, in the case of Jn the Roman method of observance of Easter. In both cases the resistance was overcome by the claim of apostolic authority supported by immense personal prestige. The influential churchmen were the two great martyrs Ignatius and Polycarp.

So far as we know neither of these made the specific claim of apostolic authorship for the Gospel which he favored. The Gospels in question were doubtless already known at Rome in advance of either visit. Polycarp's surviving Epistle shows acquaintance indeed only with the Johannine Epistles, not the Gospel, although the issue of 154 A.D. when the aged bishop of Smyrna visited Anicetus at Rome, turned upon the Passion story of the Gospel. Polycarp can hardly have debated the question of apostolic authorship. Still the parallelism in the course of events after the coming of Ignatius, champion of Mt, and the coming of Polycarp, champion of apostolic Easter observance as supported by Jn, is such as to lend color to the story related by Irenaeus (*Haer.* III, iii. 4) that Polycarp during this visit "caused many to turn away from the heresies of Valentinus and Marcion" and even that he applied the denunciations of the Johannine Epistles to Marcion himself when the latter appealed to him for recognition of the sect. Polycarp's own Epistle (vii. 1) is indeed the

probable source of this feature of the story, but we need not doubt that Polycarp when in Rome set his face as resolutely against the Marcionites as the Marcionites against him and the "Johannine" tradition which he represented.

If we may accept Tertullian's statement regarding Marcion's assault upon the *status* of the two Gospels for which the Roman church claimed apostolic authority two important results follow as to the process of canonization of the Gospels at Rome. (1) The beginnings of the claim of apostolic authorship for the fourth Gospel, resting, as we have seen, on Jn 21:24 f., must be dated slightly earlier than was maintained in my book *The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate*, 1909. Also the denial of it by Marcion. The visit of Polycarp will not have begun, but only accentuated the issue. (2) The claim of apostolic authorship for Mt will have been made considerably earlier, and with the official sanction of Roman church authority. It is with this latter that we are here primarily concerned.

If it is true that Marcion "labored to overthrow the standing of Mt" as an apostolic writing we have here the most promising clue to the origin of the strange tradition discussed in Chapter IV, which dates an official decision of the Roman church authorities in favor of the Birth-epiphany of Mt and the apostolic authority of the writing in 120 A.D. To perpetuate the memory of this momentous decision, including both circumstances and date, all that was needful was that Marcion should have referred to it in his "labored" assault. And if it be the fact that Marcion *c.* 140 A.D. did thus attempt to "overthrow the status of Mt" the first thing in his assault would almost necessarily be the statement that the claim of Mt rested on nothing more substantial than the decision of a local council *de recipiendis libris* held at Rome no more than twenty years before.

APPENDED NOTE IV

THE LITTLE APOCALYPSE IN MK AND MT

Limitations of space forbid more than a brief statement of conclusions reached in the full discussion of *GM*, Chh. VII–XI. Mt's changes from Mk nowhere indicate priority, nor the use of any source outside of Mk save S and the Old Testament. The theory of a "little apocalypse" employed by Mk solely in Ch. 13 has, however, justification to this extent: Paul does refer in I Thess. 4:15 to a "word of the Lord" typically apocalyptic in character and apparently fundamental to I and II Thess. He is not referring to an utterance in the flesh but to some "prophetic" message delivered in the name of "the Lord" in the desperate crisis of 40 A.D. (*cf.* Rev. 1:1). Slight modifications to this primitive apocalypse are already introduced by Paul, adapting it to the changed conditions of A.D. 50. Mk 13 follows the outline of this (oral?) apocalypse, combining it with certain S logia and passages from Daniel and Micah, but with further modifications made necessary by the events of A.D. 70. He attaches the whole, after a characteristic method (*cf.* 4:10 ff.; 7:17 ff.) to the authentic logion 13:1 f. Our present problem concerns the origin of verses 5 f. and 21–23 (an S logion) and the supplements and changes made by Mt.

Mt is probably correct in interpreting Mk 13:14–23 as to some extent epexegetical of verses 5–13. Neither evangelist intends to convey the idea that there are to be *two* periods of πλανή, *two* of "wars," and *two* of "tribulation," though Mark's somewhat clumsy attachment of the more detailed statement of verses 14–23 suggests that at least the πλανή against which warning is uttered in verses 21–23 is a *second*, following *after* the wars and suffering of 14–20 as the πλανή of verses 5 f. precedes the wars and suffering predicted in 7–13. In reality the whole Markan discourse is meant as a *single* warning not to be "led astray."

The general prediction (verse 6) "Many will come in my name saying, I am (the expected One) and shall lead many astray" is repeated after the long digression of verses 7–20 descriptive of the various trials to be endured before the End, in order to resume the thread of the exhortation. Mk now adds a Q logion (Mt 24:26= Lk 17:23), attaching an explanatory comment of his own (13:22 f.) of which we must speak presently. In the meantime he explains in detail the Beginning of Woes spoken of in general terms in verses 7 f. and supplemented in 9–13 by warnings to endure patiently until the

End. Verses 14–20 continue in the same vein describing the Culmination of Woes. These begin with the Profanation and continue with description of the tribulation of "those that are in Judea." The reference to scenes of the Jewish war is unmistakable and serves to date the paragraph following, introduced as it is by "at that time" (τότε).

But we are concerned only with this, a Q logion (Mt 24:26–28= Lk 17:23 f., 37) wherein Mk resumes his original warning of verse 6, adding in verse 22 an explanatory comment of his own. The relation of Mt 24:15–22 to Mk 13:14–20 has been made clear in my *Gospel of Mark* (pp. 110 ff.), it now remains only to deal with this renewed Warning against Error (Mk 13:21–23) and the relation to it of Mt 24:23–25.

Mk makes a time connection, as we have seen, between the Great Tribulation of the Jewish war and the logion of Jesus against the prognosticators who calculate the date for the Coming saying "Lo here; lo, there." To his mind this saying may be taken as a definite prediction by Jesus of the rise of a particular school of "false Christs and false prophets" not long after the Great Tribulation nor long before the celestial signs of the End. The heretics are characterized by two distinctive traits, a self-deifying "I am" style of utterance, and the performance of "great signs and wonders, to deceive, if this were possible, even the elect."

We have also seen that it is the same πλανή, *not* an earlier one, against which the warning of verses 5 f. is uttered, for the characterization is identical save for the non-mention of the magic miracles. The deceivers will come saying, "I am" and will lead many astray. The picture seems to be that of two self-deifying thaumaturgists of Syria in 60–100. Those who recall the manner in which Origen (*Ctr. Cels.* VI, xi) and the earlier heresiologues characterize the false teaching of Dositheus, Simon the Magian and Menander, an early school of Jewish Gnosticism (*cf.* Ti. 1:10, 14, 16) which we may designate the Samaritan school, will admit that it would be difficult within the same brief compass of words to describe more exactly Simon Magus and his succession; for in Acts 8:9–24 Simon Magus is made the prime author of all false doctrine heresy and schism. The "school" includes Simon's predecessor Dositheus and his successor Menander, both Samaritans like himself.

Unfortunately Acts does not enable us to date the appearance of the arch-heretic and wonder-worker Simon with complete exactness. When Luke wrote Simon was already a quasi-legendary figure; but that requires no great lapse of time. The heresiologues suggest rather the last decades of the century as the period in which Syrian Gnosticism began seriously to threaten the Church. We have no reason to

suppose that *political* false messiahs were ever a menace to it. The warning of Mk 13:5 f., 21–23 = Mt 24:4 f., 23 f. we take to be aimed at the Samaritan school of Jewish Gnosticism.

McNeile, in his comment on Mt. 24:23, shows that he fails to grasp its co-ordination with the general warning of verses 5 ff., as set forth in our text. He rightly points out that in both Mt and Mk "the words are represented as spoken after the tribulation of Antichrist, as though yet further delay must be expected before the Parousia." But he dismisses this natural and correct understanding on the ground that it "conflicts with εὐθέως κτλ. in verse 29, which forms the true sequel of verse 22." As we have observed in our text, this is not the case. Mt's "immediately after the tribulation of those days" refers primarily to the sufferings *of the Church* described in verses 9–13, of which the special sufferings of "those in Judea" after the Profanation of *a* holy place and the ensuing war and siege of Jerusalem form only a part. In two respects Mt shows on the contrary the consciousness of a considerable interval between the siege and the πλανή, and that even more distinctly than Mk: (1) He rewrites the paragraph of Mk urging endurance to the End (Mk 13:9–13), which he had previously employed in 10:17–21, making it more apparent than in Mk that he has in mind general persecution throughout the Gentile world. He also adds three verses descriptive of the πλανή, which he holds responsible for the demoralization of the Church (10–12). (2) He adds to it three supplementary verses (26–28), which give in fuller form the Q logion employed by Mk.

Bracketed between these two supplements the Markan section on the Great Tribulation is in much less danger of being confused with the special tribulation of "those that are in Judea." Taken as a whole, therefore, the changes made by Mt in Mk's Doom-chapter are indicative of a later date. On the other hand Mk's own arrangement of his material not only implies the fall of Jerusalem as already past but that "yet further delay must be expected before the Parousia." Mk cannot be dated earlier than the menace of Simonian thaumaturgic heresy (70–100), Mt must be dated (on the evidence of this as well as other adapted Mk passages) a decade or so later still.

APPENDED NOTE V

SCRIPTURE QUOTATIONS IN S

Mt has over 100 quotations and uses of the Old Testament. Of these 90 per cent leave no doubt regarding their source as between Hebrew and Greek text. Allen's demonstration (*ICC*, pp. lxif) that R's Bible is the LXX leaves no room for Soltau's theory of a final Redactor responsible for the few quotations based on the Hebrew text, most of which appear in the Preamble and none outside the additions which we have ascribed to N. The ninety per cent tell the story of final redaction and call for no further consideration. With few exceptions (which we shall consider presently) the LXX quotations are borrowed from Mk, and where variation appears it is mostly in the way of closer assimilation to the LXX text.

On the other hand the ten per cent traceable with greater or less probability, directly or indirectly, to the Hebrew text call for very careful study. Allen enumerates them as the following: [1:22 f.;] 2:5, 6, 15, 17 f., 23; 4:14–16; 8:17; 12:17–21; 13:35; 21:4 f.; 27:9. He makes the following observations concerning the group:

(1) Five of them, viz. 4:14–16; 8:17; 12:17–21; 13:35; 21:4 f., seem to have been inserted into or appended to a section of Mk by the editor.

(2) Six of them, viz. [1:23]; 2:6, 15, 17 f., 23; 27:9, might seem to be an integral part of the narrative in which they stand.

(3) One of them, 2:23, cannot be verified.

(4) All of them are introduced by a striking formula.

The formula, slightly varied, is "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet." Before continuing with Allen's observations it will be desirable at this point, in order to appreciate the true significance of his list, to interject a word of criticism.

To Allen the formula assumes somewhat undue importance. As will presently appear this is simply another instance of the well known habit of R^{mt} to adopt and stereotype phrases which he finds in his sources. Hence its non-appearance in an otherwise characteristic member of the group gives no ground for exclusion, neither can we argue for inclusion from its occurrence in an instance otherwise fundamentally unlike the rest, such as 1:23 (based exclusively on LXX). We therefore enclose in [ ] this first member of the list.

We may also remark upon the last two items.

Mt 21:4 f. attaches to Mk 11:1–10 by means of the formula referred

to a quotation blended of Is. 62:11 and Zec. 9:9. Now Mk is obviously influenced by the passage from Zec. 9:9 *in the Greek*, for he tells us that the colt was unbroken (Mk 11:2), a fact obtainable only from the LXX rendering of "the foal of an ass" by πῶλον νέον, that is, a "new" or "unbroken" colt. But Mt, who omits this erroneous inference, bases his quotation upon the Hebrew text, and with such attention to minutiae that he even makes Jesus use both animals, the ass *and* the colt. For the data we may refer to Dittmar (*Vetus Testamentum in Novo*, 1903, *ad loc.*).

The quotation 27:9 f., which Mt refers to "Jeremiah the prophet," but which is really a blend of Zec. 11:12 f. with Jer. 32:6–15; 18:2 f., is introduced by the same formula as those already mentioned and has features (indicated by Dittmar) which recall the Hebrew text. First of all, however, we should observe that there is no foundation for Jerome's pretense of having found the passage in an *apocryphon Ieremiae*. Schmidtke (*Judenchristliche Evangelien*, p. 253) reveals its real origin as follows:

> Origen, whose *Commentary on Mt* was in Jerome's hands, pointed out the possibility that the quotation Mt 27:9 might be derived from a *secreta Ieremiae scriptura;* suggesting that in case anyone took offence at his referring to the expression διά Ἱερεμίου as an error he might enquire whether the passage were not to be found in some *secreta Ieremiae*. Jerome, after his habitual manner, at once turned the possibility suggested in his copy into reality, and presented himself in the rôle of the scholar apostrophized by Origen, who finds the quotation "word for word"—*ad verbum* is emphasized to offset the observation that in Zechariah we find *verba diversa*—in an *apocryphum Jeremiae*.

Note VI will show that the pretense in question is far from exceptional with Jerome.

But we must return to Allen, who proceeds to demonstrate (in substantial agreement with Dittmar) that the basis of all the list save 1:23 is really the Hebrew rather than the Greek text:

> (5) [1:23 agrees in the main with the LXX;] 2:6 seems to be an independent rendering of the Hebrew; 2:15 is also a rendering of the Hebrew; 2:18 is apparently quoted from the LXX, with reminiscence of the Hebrew in τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς; 2:23 cannot be traced; 4:15 f. is from a Greek version but not from the LXX; 8:17 is an independent translation from the Hebrew; 12:17–21 is from the Hebrew, with reminiscence of the LXX in the last clause, or more probably from a current Greek version, which is already implied in Mk 1:11; [1] 13:35 seems to be an independent translation from the Hebrew, with reminiscence of the LXX in the first clause; 21:5 agrees partly with the Hebrew, partly with the LXX; 27:9 appears to be a free translation, with reminiscence of the LXX. Further, 2:6 seems

[1] On this quotation from Is. 42:1–3 and 4b see below.

to come in the main from Mic. 5:1–4, with assimilation of the last clause to II Sam. 5:2; 12:18 from Is. 42:1–4, with assimilation of the last clause to Hab. 1:4 (Heb.); Mt 21:5 is a conflation of Is. 62:11 and Zec. 9:9; 27:9 f. comes from Zec. 11:13, but has probably been influenced by Jer. 32:6–9.

The significance of what Allen here refers to as "reminiscences from the LXX" and "assimilations" to other Old Testament passages will be discussed presently. We must pass now from these *Reflexionscitate*, most of which have an unmistakable basis in the Hebrew text, and which we have assigned to N, to a third group, mostly found in Q, of which the derivation is more or less dubious. The question now concerns the Old Testament quotations of S.

Attention has been called in our text to the remarkable freedom of rendering displayed in the Q passage Mt 11:10 = Lk 7:27, reproduced in identical terms in Mk 1:2. This is a quotation of Mal. 3:1 on the part of S, recognizable as made *memoriter* because of the blending with ("assimilation to") Ex. 23:20. The exactitude of transcription in all three Synoptic Gospels compels us to hold that in this quotation all three rest ultimately on the same Greek document. We must now enquire whether this quotation, clearly derived from S, is typical of the S quotations generally.

It is highly desirable to gain some light on the question of the original language of S; and if the variations of its Scripture quotations from LXX are sufficient, a reasonable inference may be drawn that its original language was not Greek. This would confirm the view based by several critics on apparent mistranslations surviving both in Mt and Lk, that its original language was Aramaic.

It should be remembered that the chance of *double* survival for Semitisms in quotations is small. Translation from the original language into the Greek S known to our Synoptists would tend to eliminate many, transcription from this Greek S to the pages of our canonical evangelists (Q material) would eliminate others still. Such Semitisms as might possibly survive would tend to be in the less well known writings of the Old Testament, such as Malachi, because the inclination of translators and transcribers to substitute words carried in their memories ("reminiscences") for the actual words of the document before them would be greater in proportion to the familiarity of the text. It must needs, then, be a rarity if any Scripture quotation from S retains after this double process of purging enough of its original tincture to enable us to say with confidence: "This quotation was not made from the LXX, it is a free rendering from the Hebrew, or at least shows a degree of independence from the LXX not found in our Synoptists' quotations." This answer can really be given in the case of the blend of Mal. 3:1 with Ex. 23:20. Is it possible to apply it to other cases?

Dittmar suggests the possibility of resort to the Hebrew text in the employment of Ps. 6:9 in Mt 7:23 = Lk 13:27 where the LXX give ἀπόστητε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ πάντες οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν. The word ἐργάται in Lk and the word ἀποχωρεῖτε in Mt vary from LXX and are therefore marked by Dittmar as resting on the Hebr., though the sense is not affected. So far as the instance goes it suggests independence of the LXX. This would also be indicated by the final word in Lk, not ἀνομία, as LXX and Mt, but ἀδικία. Mt's motive for assimilating to LXX would be very strong in the case of this word ἀνομία. There remains, therefore, a certain probability that S rendered freely, Mt assimilating to LXX as he has done in several Mk quotations.

A certain possibility of independence from LXX may also be indicated by the use of σοφία instead of φρόνησις in Mt 12:42 = Lk 11:31 in quoting I Kings 10:4; but Ms. A adds the word σοφία in verse 7.

The Q material unfortunately furnishes but few further examples. If we limit ourselves strictly to Harnack's 59 sections there are no employments of the Old Testament close enough to apply our tests except in the Temptation story (Mt 4:1–11 = Lk 4:1–13). Here Dt. 8:3, Ps. 91:11 f. and Dt. 6:16 and 13 are quoted by Mt and Lk with slight differences from one another (in 4:4 Mt extends the quotation to the end of the verse quoted; in 4:10 Lk includes the clause "to keep thee" omitted by Mt). There is no trace of influence from the Hebrew in either Mt or Lk, save in some forms of the β text. (Syr. Sin. in Mt 4:4 has "mouth of *the Lord*" with Hebr. Codex D in Mt 4:7 has οὐ πειράσεις where other texts of Mt and all texts of Lk have with LXX οὐκ ἐκπειράσεις. The D reading *might* be regarded as an independent rendering of the Hebrew, though there is no difference of meaning.) The most that can be said regarding these three quotations found in Q material is that they show a certain freedom in dividing the quotation from Ps. 91 by needlessly introducing "and" before "they shall bear thee up," which *perhaps* exceeds what we should expect from Mt or Lk. All three quotations are made *memoriter*, but such would naturally be the case in any event. In the quotation from Dt 6:13 we have the interesting phenomenon of agreement between Mt, Lk, and the A text of LXX against the Hebrew; for the Hebrew has "fear" instead of "worship" and does not include the word "only." This should probably be regarded as a case of dependence by the New Testament writers on the LXX, but cannot be safely ascribed to S because of the tendency of translators and transcribers to substitute the text more familiar to themselves.

Harnack also includes in his Section 22, though only by way of conjectural restoration, the direction to the Twelve to "shake off the dust from your feet" which Dittmar includes among his "quotations" because of the resemblance to Is. 52:2. Now Mk 6:11 in recording

the same direction uses the LXX term "clay" (χοῦν), but Mt 10:14 and Lk 10:11 use κονιορτόν, following the Hebrew "dust." This looks like a possible survival of the phraseology of S.

But we need not strictly limit ourselves to Q. All critics are agreed that S included the *bath qol* of the Baptism "Thou art my Son," etc., because that is presupposed in the two temptations which begin "If thou art the Son of God." Again it has been shown to be probable that S included the Antitheses of the Sermon on the Mount in spite of the partial omission of the section by Lk. In the case of the former passage we shall endeavor to show that the quotation from Is. 42:1–4 in Mt 12:18–21 is taken from S, where it applied to the divine call of Jesus at his baptism, and had been transferred by Mt to a new application, that of Jesus' repressing the clamor of the possessed. On this quotation see below. If we include these more doubtful elements of S the question of its employment of the Hebrew assumes a new aspect.

In the Antitheses of the Sermon on the Mount the Scripture quotations are given with the freedom of *memoriter* citation, as we should expect in any case in view of their brevity and the great familiarity of the decalogue. The four are included in Hawkins' table of "Quotations recorded as spoken in the part of the Sermon on the Mount peculiar to Mt" (*OS*, p. 155, Class III), three of them (Nos. 3, 4, and 5, Mt 5:31, 33, 38) are of sufficient extent and near enough to exact citation to warrant our consideration. Mt 5:31 quotes freely Dt. 24:1, omitting the unnecessary clause "and shall give it into her hand" (supplied by Syr. Sin.). The quotation coincided substantially with LXX, but less closely than Mt 19:7 = Mk 10:4. All that can be said regarding this difference is that the briefer form of Mt 5:31 shows greater freedom. Nowhere is there evidence of resort to the Hebrew. In 5:33 the command "Commit no perjury" (οὐκ ἐπιορκήσεις) is less literal as a rendering of the Hebrew than LXX "Ye shall not swear by my name to an injustice" (οὐκ ὀμεῖσθε τῷ ὀνόματί μου ἐπ' ἀδίκῳ); but one can hardly call the former an independent rendering, because in such loose citation it might equally well be a mere abbreviation of the Greek. Mt 5:38 "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth" only differs from either Hebrew or LXX in Ex. 21:24; Lev. 24:20 and Dt. 19:21 in the addition of the conjunction "and" (omitted in the β text). Obviously no inference can be drawn as between Hebrew and Greek text. At the utmost it might be said that the addition of the conjunction shows a certain freedom in citation.

There remains, however, one quotation of greater length than any other in the Gospel, the quotation of Is. 42:1–4 in Mt 12:17–21, which has no less than fifty-one words. Of these more than half (thirty-one according to Hawkins' count) vary from those of the LXX. Eleven of these thirty-one according to Dittmar's data (p. 28) coincide with

the Hebrew as against the LXX, all eleven being in the portion which cites Is. 42:1–3. Strangely enough the final clause "and in his name shall the Gentiles hope," added from Is. 42:4b, is conspicuously derived from the LXX, which gives identically the same words;[2] whereas the Hebrew has "and the isles shall wait for his law" (*torah*, *i.e.*, "teaching," "revelation," or "commandment"). Division of the quotation seems to be imperative, in fact even Schlatter (p. 402) is disposed to attribute the supplemental quotation of verse 21 (= Is. 42:4b) to "a later hand." It appears to be in fact R's extension of the extract as in Mt 4:9 or Lk 3:5 f. Omission of the intervening words of Is. 42:4a, and sentiment (*cf.* 28:19) as well, support this probability, which becomes almost a certainty when the transfer of the quotation from its proper application is brought into the account.

If the above reasoning is correct it becomes probable that the Scripture quotations of S were made on the basis, or at least with knowledge, of the Hebrew text, though in the course of translation and transcription most of this original coloration has disappeared. *Per contra* it becomes more apparent than ever that R's reliance was the LXX. Incidentally we gather that the attempted distinction of Allen, Hawkins, and others between "quotations avowedly introduced by the Author or Editor of the Gospel" and quotations otherwise introduced has little value. It is true that quite a series of quotations are introduced by the formula "This took place that the scripture might be fulfilled which was spoken by," or the like. As we have observed, many of these quotations are derived from some source which employed the Hebrew. It does not at all follow that the formula was drawn from this source. On the contrary R^{mt} himself is a notorious coiner of formulas. Moreover, in this case as well as many others he had before him a model for the formula (Mk 1:2 (*cf.* Mt 3:3); 13:14 (*cf.* Mt 14:15); 14:49). That others as well as R^{mt} could use similar formulas is evidenced by Jn 13:18; 17:12; 19:24, 36 as well as by the spurious verses Mt 27:35 and Mk 15:28. The quotations thus introduced by Mt in most cases show familiarity with the Hebrew text. We have ascribed these to N, meaning thereby an Aramaic targum of Mk to which the Scripture fulfillments had been attached. Others ascribe them to an early (Aramaic?) collection of *testimonia*. In either case they convey no further light on the sources of the Gospel. At most they speak for contact at some point in its history with an Aramaic-speaking Christian community.

There remain two extended passages in Q of great importance,

[2] Καὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιοῦσιν. α and β texts vary slightly in the construction of ὀνόματι, the α text using the preposition ἐπί (or the dative alone without preposition) the β text using ἐν. Dittmar marks this ἐν as in agreement with the Hebrew. The reason why is not apparent. We therefore disregard it.

both of which are indicated to be quotations by their poetic form, one of them explicitly avowing itself a quotation from "the wisdom of God." This is not the title of an individual book but the general designation applied to the group of writings known as "wisdom." Clement of Rome in fact quotes a closely kindred passage (Prov. 1:23–33) in *ad Cor.* lvii. 3–7 as the utterance of "Wisdom, source of all the virtues" (ἡ πανάρετος Σοφία). This long Q quotation is given by Mt in 23:34–36, by Lk in two parts: Lk 11:49–51, where the source is named as "the wisdom of God," and 13:34 f., which Mt 23:34–36 shows to be the immediate sequel of 11:49–51. The original of both these quotations has perished, so that no inference can be drawn as to language employed. As regards poetic form our translation (Part III) will enable the reader to judge whether the logion Mt 11:25 f. = Lk 10:21 f. is or is not quoted from a wisdom source. If such be the case the contention of some that S did not employ extended quotations will meet decided opposition. Mt 23:34–36 = Lk 11:49–51; 13:34 f. is by no means brief, and as an undoubted Q passage must be derived from S. The same is true of Mt 11:25 f. = Lk 10:21 f., whose source is unfortunately even more obscure than that of Lk 11:49–51. The source of Mt 12:18–20 is not in doubt, and the citation is extensive. Unfortunately we have only inferential evidence that Mt borrowed it from S. Nevertheless the coincident and cumulative evidence of the three passages leaves little room to doubt that the quotations of S, though not limited to the canonical Old Testament, were at least as extensive as those of Mk or Lk. Where we can consult the original it would appear that they were cited *memoriter* from the Hebrew, or in a free Greek translation independent of the LXX. "Reminiscence of LXX" easily accounts for the assimilation of a few brief and familiar Old Testament passages by our Synoptic evangelists to the Greek rendering to which they were most accustomed.

There remains a small group of quotations less easily determinable. Very slight indications appear in the quotation from Hos. 6:6 twice employed by Mt (9:13 and 12:7) of derivation from the Hebr. (Most of the LXX texts have ἤ, not Καὶ οὐ with Mt and Hebr.) If the evidence has sufficient weight, the two passages should be classified as N, otherwise R.

Evidence for the use of the Hebrew text is stronger in the quotation erroneously ascribed to "Isaiah the prophet" (an indication of borrowing) in 13:35. At least the latter half of the quotation is independent of the LXX. Again we may ascribe the citation to N.

The evidence in the quotation of Dt. 19:15 in 18:16 is of the same very dubious character as in 9:13 and 12:7. Reference to N is possible.

In 21:9, 15, Mt takes over Mk's use of Ps. 118:25 f., apparently understanding the Hebrew word *Hoshanna* (rightly rendered σῶσον

δή by the LXX) as an ascription of praise! To Wernle this is proof positive that R knew neither Aramaic nor Hebrew. It can hardly be called decisive. However, in the next verse (21:16) R's quotation from Ps. 8:3 coincides *verbatim* with LXX, and the same is true of the long quotation in verse 42 which he takes over word for word from Mk.

Mt 24:30a adds a quotation from Zec. 12:10–14, but whether on the basis of LXX or Hebr. it is impossible to say.

In Mt 26:31 the quotation from Zec. 13:7 is taken over without change from Mk save for the addition at the close of the words "of the flock." Those two words τῆς ποίμνης appear in LXX A but not in other LXX texts.

Finally in 27:43a if the use of "trusted *in God*" instead of "trusted in *the Lord*" can be regarded as evidence of dependence on the Hebrew text of Ps. 22:9 we have one more Scripture quotation to ascribe to N rather than to R personally. The stylizing of Mk 15:34 in 27:46 cannot be called assimilation to the Hebrew text in spite of Dittmar's symbols.

Systematic examination of all possibilities of influence from the Hebrew text in the Scripture quotations of Mt thus tends only to confirm the conclusions reached in the case of the more conspicuous instances. A certain strain of influence from the Hebrew is undeniably apparent in the passages classified under N. These passages, however, are not early or authentic, but conspicuously late and apocryphal in character. They are not due primarily to R^{mt}, as maintained by Soltau, but are taken over by him from some source either written or, if oral, so completely stereotyped as to have all the values of a written source. Its nature, as inferred from the data at our disposal, has been sufficiently described.

Influence from the Hebrew text is less easy to prove in the case of S. Reasons why this should be expected have already been given. A few data from Q material lead to the conclusion that S employed the Hebrew text, or at least used renderings quite independent of LXX.

R is always dependent on the LXX.

APPENDED NOTE VI

MT AND THE JEWISH-CHRISTIAN GOSPELS

CENTURIES of illusion and false reasoning have been caused by the superficiality and egotism of Jerome, who claimed for himself the discovery of the "original Hebrew" of the Gospel of Mt. Ever since the declaration of Papias referred to in our General Introduction (a statement reflecting current belief in 140–150 A.D.) that "Matthew compiled the logia in the Hebrew tongue and everyone used to translate them as he was able," travellers like Pantaenus who chanced upon the Aramaic rendering of our own Greek Mt current among the Nazarenes of Mesopotamia and known to modern scholars as the *Gospel of the Nazarenes* (*Ev. Naz.*), were exposed to the temptation to invert the relation between the two, calling the targum the original and the Greek Mt the translation. Of course the Nazarenes themselves did their utmost to promote this misrepresentation, just as in modern times the "original Latin" of Mk is exhibited in Venice and the "original Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians" at Saloniki. We may imagine Papias getting his vague information directly or indirectly through Ignatius just as Clement of Alexandria gets his through Pantaenus.

Eusebius in his *H. E.*, written in 325, had as yet no direct knowledge of the *Ev. Naz.*, for he records its survival down to the time of Pantaenus (*i.e.*, *c.* 185 A.D.) as a noteworthy fact. Between 325 and the writing of his *Theophania* in 333 he had obtained a copy, doubtless the same which Jerome subsequently made use of in the great library of Pamphilus left by Eusebius at Caesarea. From the respectful tone of Eusebius' references in the *Theophania*, he would seem to have given some weight to the claim of the "Aramaic Gospel" to be the "Hebrew" original of Mt. A later writer, Apollinaris of Laodicea, who lived for years at Antioch and whose lectures there were attended by Jerome, was fully convinced. Apollinaris was an expert Hebraist and made large use in his Commentaries of the *Ev. Naz.*, treating it as the actual original of Mt. But it was not till early in the fifth century, many years after the death of Apollinaris, that Jerome came forward with boastful claims to have discovered and translated the "original Hebrew" of Mt, dishonestly plagiarizing the work of earlier and vastly more reliable scholars. This was the beginning of the delusion.

In spite of the bold words of Theodore of Mopsuestia denouncing as fraudulent Jerome's pretensions to have discovered "a fifth gospel"

the great influence of Jerome added to that of Apollinaris led to the marginal collation (in the so-called Zion group of Mss.) of variants to the readings of Mt. Many of these still display, the rubric τὸ Ἰουδαικόν, that is "the Hebrew (Gospel)." By the use of these variants, along with other data, Schmidtke ("Judenchristliche Evangelien" in *TU*, 37, 1911) has at last determined beyond question the real nature of the work. The *Ev. Naz.* was an Aramaic targum of our own Greek Mt, doubtless of the same type as the "translations of the Gospel of John and of the Acts of the Apostles" which Epiphanius, Jerome's contemporary, learned from his Jewish convert Joseph were still in use among the Aramaic-speaking Christians of Tiberias in Galilee. Their case of books for reading in worship contained also the Aramaic Mt.

We owe to Jerome an unquestioned debt for several considerable extracts (*not* translated by himself from the Aramaic, with which he was not familiar, but filched for the most part from Apollinaris, whose works had been condemned as heretical). We are his debtors also for the indirect service of causing later transcribers of Mt to add in the margin the variant readings of τὸ Ἰουδαικόν, thus enabling us to confirm the statement of Epiphanius that the "Hebrew" Mt used by the Nazarenes was "complete," as against certain Ebionite gospels which rejected the Infancy chapters. *Ev. Naz.* was not only quite as "complete" as Mt but even more, for it added all sorts of corrections, embellishments, and edifying "improvements." These leave no question in the mind of critics that it was just such an Aramaic targum of Mt as we have described in the words of the converted Galilean Joseph, a "translation" of Mt into the vernacular.

But however great our debt to Jerome for knowledge which he did not intend to convey, it is more than offset by the wrong impression he *did* intend to convey, bolstering it up by dishonest assertions of discovery and scholarly publication. One of the worst of these repeated acts of dishonesty was the appropriation from Origen *as translations made by himself* from the "Hebrew original" of Mt, of certain passages quoted by Origen from "the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*." This totally different composition, current in Egypt and Transjordan, a Greek gospel, not orthodox nor "complete" but Ebionite in type, making not Peter but James its supreme apostolic authority, and often nearer to L than to Mt in contents, Jerome absurdly identified with *Ev. Naz.*, apparently because both were cited as Jewish, which was indeed the fact.

Jerome not only appropriated from Origen the passages which the Alexandrian scholar had drawn from the *Ev. Hebr.* but declared them to have been translated by himself from the "original Hebrew Matthew." However, he inadvertently betrayed the plagiarism by in-

cluding together with the extract some of the context belonging to Origen himself. Exactly the same thing occurred again in an alleged citation from his "Hebrew" gospel which he filched from Ignatius. The fact should not surprise us because this method of composition was habitual with Jerome, who constantly professes to have personally read the extracts he borrows from his more industrious or better informed predecessor.[1]

The inclusion by Jerome among the extracts he professes to have made from the *Ev. Naz.* of extracts previously made by Origen from the *Ev. Hebr.* was a source of endless confusion to all subsequent scholars until the epoch-marking work of Schmidtke. At last we know that the two writings were totally diverse. Indeed it is highly probable that Jerome's first real acquaintance with the *Ev. Naz.* was a transient view of the copy obtained by Eusebius for the library at Caesarea. The view was necessarily superficial because of Jerome's ignorance of Aramaic.

As against Zahn, who conjectured that Origen himself might have obtained this copy on one of his two visits from Caesarea to Bostra and Gerasa, Schmidtke makes it probable that Eusebius himself in his earlier writings had no access to the original, though on Zahn's view it would have formed part of his own library. Origen shows equal lack of acquaintance with it. Hence the long extract from *Ev. Naz.*, ascribed to *Ev. Hebr.* in the Latin reworking of *Origen's Commentary on Mt*, is drawn not from Origen's but from Apollinaris' *Commentary*.

As we have seen, the credit claimed by Jerome for the discovery of this monumental mare's nest is really due to Apollinaris of Laodicea. When Jerome, as yet ignorant even of Hebrew, arrived in Antioch on his way to a five years' sojourn in the wilderness of Chalcis, near Berea-Aleppo, Apollinaris was the great expositor of the Hebrew Scriptures in the Antioch school and Jerome attended his lectures. Apollinaris' coming to Antioch from his Phrygian home (situated in plain sight of Hierapolis, the see of Papias) may, or may not, have

[1] Epiphanius has long enjoyed the reputation of the most blundering fool among the post-Nicene fathers. His contemporary Jerome has strong claims to be considered the most unscrupulous knave. Schmidtke has given careful and minute study to Jerome's methods in the fraud (such it was in the judgment of Theodore of Mopsuestia, another contemporary and the greatest exegete in the renowned school of historical criticism and exegesis at Antioch) of the alleged "authentic Hebrew" of Mt. After further comparison of the more extended studies of von Sychowski (1894), Bernoulli (1895), and Grützmacher (1901, '06, and '08), Schmidtke has this forcible opinion to express as to Jerome's literary methods: "He was one of the most shameless, most deceitful literary frauds and freebooters that ever lived. No book could be admitted to exist which he had not read, considered and excerpted, no important idea which he had not originated, no unusual discovery for which he did not claim credit. He even pretended knowledge of books which never existed."

been partly due to Papias' references to a recently extant Hebrew original of Mt. At all events Apollinaris became the greatest Hebraist of his age, sojourned among the Aramaic-speaking Nazarenes of Berea and accepted their valuation of the *Ev. Naz.* Whether during his stay in the region of Chalcis from 374 to 379 A.D. Jerome ever actually saw a copy of the *Ev. Naz.* is open to doubt. It was not until more than twenty years after Apollinaris' works were proscribed as heretical, and indeed long after the death of the great Hebraist, that Jerome began to put forward his claims. Nearly all his citations from the *Ev. Naz.* are filched from the terse Commentary of Apollinaris.

We must demur to Schmidtke's claim that Eusebius continued to give credence to the reports of second-century fathers of the survival of "the Hebrew Mt" among the Nazarenes, even after actual inspection of the *Ev. Naz.* In spite of Schmidtke's argument (p. 56 f.) the two excerpts made in Eusebius' *Theophania* hardly warrant his inference. Indeed the form of citation seems to the present writer to indicate misgivings on Eusebius' part rather than confirmation of his previously expressed beliefs. He must at least have recognized a wide margin of variation from the apostolic original. Apollinaris and Jerome should have full credit for their "discovery."

The Alexandrian fathers have apparently as little knowledge of *Ev. Naz.* as Apollinaris or Jerome of the *Ev. Hebr.* While the two writings are probably not far apart in date of origin their area of circulation was different. *Ev. Naz.* was current in Aramaic-speaking Euphratean Syria, whose contacts were with Mesopotamia on the east and Antioch on the west. *Ev. Hebr.* circulated in Decapolis, where in all the principal cities, including Bostra and Gerasa, the language had for centuries been Greek, this language becoming increasingly dominant as the policy of Trajan and Hadrian of strengthening the fortifications of the great trade-route from the Nile to the Euphrates valley led to more and more pronounced Hellenization. The contacts of Transjordan through which passed this extremely important artery of trade were all with Egypt. In fact the third legion, called Cyrenaica from its Egyptian recruiting ground, not only played a conspicuous part in the siege of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. but later adopted Bostra as its permanent headquarters. If, then, Origen did encounter in Bostra or Gerasa any Jewish-christian gospel (a theory which has no documentary support) it would naturally be the Greek *Ev. Hebr.* rather than the Aramaic *Ev. Naz.*

The question of the origin and nature of the writing variously known as "The Gospel according to the Hebrews," the Ebionite "Matthew," and perhaps also "The Gospel according to the Twelve Apostles," is exceedingly complicated. If we provisionally limit our judgment to pre-Eusebian testimony, postponing the difficult and

dubious task of unravelling the twisted and unreliable strands of Epiphanius' fabric, the matter will be simplified. As before, Schmidtke will be our safest guide, though not without the exercise of personal judgment.

As indicated in our text the earliest witness to the Ebionite writing is indirect. Eusebius tells us that it was employed by Hegesippus in his five books of *Memoirs* (*c.* 170), from which Eusebius drew his own full account of the life and death of James the Just. Hegesippus was of Jewish birth [2] but a believer of the "Catholic" school. His "Reminiscences" aimed to show the agreement of orthodox doctrine everywhere with the teaching of the Apostles transmitted through their successors at Jerusalem. He described at great length the character and martyr fate of James, the choice of his successor Symeon, the frustrated attempt of Thebuthis to secure the succession to himself, and the persecution under Domitian which had led to the sending to Rome of the two surviving members of Jesus' family, a certain James and Zoker (Zacharias), grandsons of Jesus' brother Jude. As harmless Galilean peasants these two survivors of the family were contemptuously dismissed by Domitian, but on their return (*c.* 90) were welcomed by the brethren as "witnesses and leaders." Hegesippus compared the doctrine of the church in Jerusalem, standard of orthodoxy in his time, with that of the churches of his period, especially Corinth and Rome, and found no deviation. A safely guarded episcopal succession had excluded heresy. The church in Jerusalem remained "a pure virgin."

Hegesippus wrote in Greek, but being of Jewish parentage could, and (as Eusebius explicitly testifies) did avail himself of Aramaic writings.

> He quotes (says Eusebius) from the Gospel according to the Hebrews and from the Syriac (that is, "Aramaic") Gospel. He also makes some statements on his own account on the basis of the Hebrew speech, showing that he was a convert from Judaism. He also reports other things on the basis of unwritten Jewish (that is, Jewish-christian) tradition.

The reference shows quite clearly that *Ev. Naz.*, "the Aramaic gospel" and *Ev. Hebr.* were not the same. The former was at this time still known to Eusebius only by report. The *Ev. Hebr.* was not written in "Syriac," and was already known to Eusebius, as we shall see, by personal inspection.

The two Alexandrian fathers, Clement and Origen, give actual extracts from the writing which they designate "The Gospel according to the Hebrews." One of these, twice quoted by Clement with slight variation, occurs also with an equal degree of variation as logion

[2] The name is a Grecized form of "Joseph."

II of the second collection of logia of Jesus found at Behneseh (Oxyrhynchus) in the Fayoum. Clement reports this freely (*Strom.* II, ix, 45, and again V, xiv, 96) as

> He that seeks will not cease till he find,
> Finding he will be amazed,
> By amazement he shall find kingly rule,
> And in his kingdom he shall find rest.

The Oxyrhynchus logion, as restored in the text of Klostermann (*Kleine Texte*, 1910, p. 17) may be rendered:

> Jesus says:
> Let not the seeker cease until he find,
> And when he has found he will be amazed,
> And by amazement he shall find kingly rule,
> And having attained to kingly rule he shall find rest.

Origen also gives an extract from it in two different writings (*In Joh. tom.* II, 12 and *In Jer. hom.* XV, 4). It relates to the Temptation and reports Jesus' experience as corresponding to that of the prophet Ezekiel (Ez. 8:3). This Jewish-christian writing corrected the impression likely to be produced in minds unfamiliar with the midrashic style [3] by placing in Jesus' own mouth another version of Mt 4:8 as follows:

> Just now my mother the Holy Spirit took me by one of my hairs and carried me away to the great mountain Tabor.

These very early and undisputed fragments should suffice by themselves alone to prove that the Ebionite "gospel," while bearing some special relation of dependence to our own Greek Mt, was nevertheless an entirely separate writing in the Greek language (though probably translated from Aramaic) known in Egypt *c.* 200 A.D., as belonging to "the Hebrews." The *Stichometry* of Nicephorus, a book-catalogue based on very ancient data, even gives its length in lines (στίχοι). It contained 2,200 as against 1,950 for Jn and 2,480 for Mt. In Egypt it enjoyed sufficient reputation to be quoted by great orthodox writers such as Clement and Origen with a certain measure of respect, as though its statements, while not authoritative, might have a basis of truth, and even to have its logia excerpted in anthologies. It was also known in Palestine in the time of Hegesippus (*c.* 170) and regarded there with sufficient favor to be employed by this great champion of orthodoxy. Another extract, clearly proved by Schmidtke to be Origen's, though known to us only through the plagiarism of Jerome, will show the characteristic which would espe-

[3] *Cf.* Origen, *Ctra. Cels.* I, xliii f.

cially commend it to Hegesippus, a champion of apostolic succession *through James the Just.* Jerome's Latin rendering of the logion already cited from Origen (his pretense of having translated the Hebrew Mt "into Latin and Greek" contained the modicum of truth that he *did* render Origen's Greek, which he imagined to be translated from the "Hebrew," into Latin) is given as follows in his *Comm. in Mich.* at 7:6:

> Qui crediderit evangelio, quod *secundum Hebraeos* editum nuper transtulimus (!), in quo ex persona salvatoris dicitur: "modo tulit me mater mea, sanctus spiritus, in uno capillorum meorum," non dubitabit dicere sermonem dei ortum esse de spiritu.

He gives in *De viris ill.* 2, something much more important.

> Evangelium quoque, quod appellatur *secundum Hebraeos* et a me nuper in Graecum sermonem Latinumque translatum est, *quo et Origenes saepe utitur*, post resurrectionem salvatoris refert: "dominus autem, cum dedisset sindonem servo sacerdotis, ivit ad Jacobum et apparuit ei; juraverat enim Jacobus se non comesturum panem ab illa hora, qua biberat calicem dominus, donec videret eum resurgentem a dormientibus," rursusque post paululum: "adferte, ait dominus, mensam et panem," statimque additur: "tulit panem et benedixit et fregit et dedit Jacobo Justo et dixit ei: frater mi, comede panem tuum, quia resurrexit filius hominis a dormientibus."

Origen could hardly have chosen a passage better fitted to convey a definite idea of the community of Christians to whom this "gospel" belonged, of their relation to other Christian bodies, and particularly of the relation of their gospel, which our earliest witnesses speak of as "according to Matthew," to the canonical Gospel of that name.

Let us note first of all the points of contact with Hegesippus. For Ebionites the supreme apostolic authority was "James the Just." To him (at Nazareth?) Jesus "went" (*ivit*), after refuting at Jerusalem the false assertions of his enemies. This appearance to James ignores any to Peter or any other of the disciples, and commits to James in solemn words of institution the sacrament which breaks the annual fast celebrating the Passion. James was the head of the Jerusalem succession, championed by Hegesippus as supreme guardian of orthodoxy. The title "James the Just" employed here is otherwise known only through Hegesippus, who explains its origin, *and* Clement of Alexandria. Moreover in the fragment Jesus refers to himself as "the Son of Man," a phenomenon unknown outside of our Synoptic writers—with one exception. Hegesippus, in his story of the martyrdom of "James the Just" relates James' "testimony" given "with a great voice" to the multitude assembled at Passover from "the pinnacle of the temple":

> Why do ye ask me concerning Jesus *the Son of Man?* He himself is sitting in heaven at the right hand of the great Power, and is about to come on the clouds of heaven.

Dependence by Hegesippus on the Ebionite apokryphon for at least a part of his data concerning "James the Just" is put beyond dispute by the fact that the Jewish father's James is not only late and legendary, but typically and unmistakably *an Ebionite.* Hegesippus described him as follows:

> James the brother of the Lord succeeded to the government of the Church in conjunction with the apostles. He has been called " the Just " by all from the time of our Saviour to the present day; for there were many that bore the name of James. He was consecrate from his mother's womb; and he drank no wine nor strong drink, nor did he eat flesh. No razor came upon his head; he did not anoint himself with oil, nor did he use the bath.

Moreover Hegesippus further maintained that James was a Christian counterpart of the Jewish high priest (!) his intercession for the guilty city being alone effective, for the siege began "at once" when James was murdered. The passage in which Hegesippus relates this is continuous with that just cited, but clearly overlaps it, as might be expected if drawn from a source:

> He alone was permitted to enter into the Holy place; for he wore not woolen but linen garments. And he was in the habit of entering alone into the temple, and was frequently found upon his knees begging forgiveness for the (Jewish) people, so that his knees became hard like those of a camel, in consequence of his constantly bending them in his worship of God, and asking forgiveness for the (Jewish) people. Because of his exceeding great justice he was called " the Just," and Oblias (*ôphel 'am*) which signifies in Greek " Bulwark of the people," and " Justification " in accordance with what the prophets [4] declare concerning him.

Epiphanius, whose use of the apokryphon will be discussed later, completes the picture of the high-priestly intercessor by declaring that James wore the golden *petalon* or high-priestly diadem. Significantly enough the same extraordinary claim is made on behalf of the Apostle John (also, according to primitive Asian tradition, a martyr) by Polycrates of Ephesus. The explanation is that Hegesippus, Polycrates, and Epiphanius have taken literally what originally was a figure of speech.

From Hbr. 9:11 f. through a succession of early Christian writings martyrs are spoken of as "priests" because on account of their immediate resurrection (the "first" resurrection) they are able in heaven

[4] "The prophets" in question seem to be uncanonical, though Jer. 6:27 is probably the starting point; but *cf.* Sap. 18:20–19:1, Syriac *Apoc. of Baruch* ii. 2 and *Assumptio Mos.* xi. 17.

to make intercession for sin. In Rev. 7:9–17 the glorified Christ is surrounded by a bodyguard of such "priests" (20:4–6) of whom the seer declares:

> These are they that come out of the great tribulation, and they washed their robes and made them white (by participation) in the blood of the Lamb. Therefore are they before the throne of God; and they serve Him day and night in His temple.

The *Apocalypse of Peter* relates how at the disciples' request Jesus grants them vision of "the justified" in paradise. After the usual description of their glorified appearance and abode Jesus explains (verse 20) "This is the place of *your* high priests, the men who have been justified." The intercession of the martyred James and John in paradise is clearly the starting point of the tradition of their priestly conduct and clothing with the high priest's insignia. The fathers who take it literally are merely perverting a very ancient poetic idea, whose emanation point was Jerusalem. Of its bearing on the question now before us more hereafter.

Eusebius follows next in date after Origen. His testimony is of especial value because he had what he also calls "the Gospel according to the Hebrews" before him and studied its contents. I cannot agree with Schmidtke that Eusebius held the erroneous belief that Papias had used *Ev. Hebr.* for his story of "a woman accused of many sins before the Lord;" for while there can be little doubt that the story is the same introduced by Western texts as Jn 7:53–8:11, and while Eusebius does mention the fact that *it also occurs* in *Ev. Hebr.*, doubtless in fulfilment of his promise to note such employments, his carefully chosen language indicates uncertainty rather than certainty. The form which he found in Papias was no doubt (as Schmidtke notes, and as had previously been argued by myself [5]), substantially that of the Armenian Edschmiadzin codex which begins:

> A certain woman was *taken in sins*, against whom all bore witness that she was deserving of death. They brought her to Jesus, etc.

It is most likely because of the wide variation of this Asian form of the story from that which he found in *Ev. Hebr.* that Eusebius avoids committing himself to the (erroneous) idea that Papias used the work, and merely reports that the same story (substantially) *could also be found* (ἣν περιέχει) in *Ev. Hebr.*

The *pericope adulterae* is attached by nearly all texts which contain it to Jn, either as an *addendum* at the end, or somewhere in the context of Jn 7:36–8:20.[6] This form is certainly earlier and more au-

[5] *Expositor*, LXIII (March, 1905), "Papias and the Gospel acc. to the Hebrews."
[6] See Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 156.

thentic than the Armenian. We may be sure it was appended to the Gospels, or inserted in them by scribes for the same reason as led to the incorporation of readings from τὸ Ἰουδαικόν, viz., the belief that it represented the "original."

But why was it attached to Jn? Why not to Mt, or after Lk 21:37 f., where it is placed by a small group of Calabrian Mss. called Ferrariani, a group which also display the Ἰουδαικόν variants?

We can agree with either that group of critics who hold that the story was attached to Jn because Papias had given it as one of his "traditions of John" (παραδόσεις Ἰωάννου), or with those who hold (with Schmidtke) that Papias referred to no written source. The one thing fairly certain about its placing is that *whether in Lk 21 or Jn 7* the location was not a mere conjecture but corresponded to its placing in *Ev. Hebr.* A comparison of the opening words of the story with Lk 21:37 f. will show that there is real literary connection. Lk omitted the story, which probably formed part of his L source, but kept the framework. Scribes who sought for it a place in Jn were guided by Jn 8:20 which agreed with Lk 21:1, 37 f. in locating Jesus "in the treasury;" for the "other" story with which this formed a pair (Euseb.) was the story of the Widow's Mites, located according to Lk 21:1–4 "in the treasury." Our conjecture is that in *Ev. Hebr.*, which has points of contact with L, the two anecdotes stood together, *and that they were related as utterances of the Apostle John.* Reasons will appear later.

From the foregoing references, comprising all that the second, third, and fourth centuries can tell regarding *Ev. Hebr.*, certain meager yet important results already appear. The Ebionite apokryphon was clearly dependent on Mt and probably on Lk as well. It was thoroughly Jewish-christian in the sense of representing the original church at Jerusalem. It centered upon James the Just, primate of the Church, high priest of the new Israel, repudiating Paul. It reflected the intense loyalty of this church to the Law (Acts 21:20) and its expectation of a prompt coming of "the Son of Man" to occupy the throne of David. The leader of the Twelve Apostles was "John." Peter and Andrew came third and fourth in the list. No traces of Gnostic heresy appeared in it, else it could not have been treated with even moderate respect by Hegesippus, Clement, and Origen.

The point of special interest for our present enquiry is the curious intermingling of material relating to James as head of this mother-church of Christianity, a leader whose Christian career could not be dated within the period of Jesus' earthly life, with material drawn from Mt and Lk, if not Mk also, and combined with *agrapha* probably associated with the names of individual members of the Twelve. An explanation of this as well as of a number of other perplexities

may be derived from certain extracts which Epiphanius seems to have drawn from the work when a copy had finally reached him (perhaps from the Ebionite colony in Cyprus near his own residence at Constanza), after previously having formulated his views on the mistaken basis of the *Clementina*. The almost hopeless tangle this "worst blunderer of antiquity" made of his description of the Ebionites is unravelled with extraordinary skill by Schmidtke, from whom we shall borrow certain results which appear well founded, while venturing to dissent as regards others. Let the dissent be first frankly expressed, even if argument be excluded through space restriction.

Schmidtke strongly disapproves the identification made by Hilgenfeld, Handmann, Zahn, and Harnack between the Ebionite apokryphon and an unknown writing which Origen dismisses along with the so-called "Gospel according to the Egyptians" as current under the title "Gospel of the Twelve" (ἐπιγεγραμμένον ΤΩΝ ΔΩΔΕΚΑ). This seems to Schmidtke to evince less respect than Origen would naturally show for a writing which in his *Comments on Jn* he quotes by the designation "Gospel according to the Hebrews." Schmidtke also objects that the writing superscribed "Of the Twelve" is properly to be identified with that current in the time of Ephraem Syrus (360–373) under the name of a certain Kukaja. According to Maruta, Syrian bishop of Maipherqat *c.* 400, the Kukaie "construct for themselves twelve evangelists with the names of the twelve apostles." We have here a late but undoubted trace of the Ebionite apokryphon, if indeed the name of the sect itself be not a corruption from Kokaba, the original seat of the Ebionites in Transjordan. But the Kukaie, according to Theodore bar Kuni (*c.* 800) held a corrupt type of Gnostic syncretism remote from the simple christianized Judaism of the Ebionites. Schmidtke will not allow that the Ebionite apokryphon could have been thus corrupted.

For these two reasons Schmidtke rejects as fabulous certain statements of Epiphanius tending to show that the Ebionites had but a single sacred writing which was (by outsiders) variously designated as "According to Matthew," "According to the Twelve Apostles," or (from its possessors) "According to the Hebrews." We may take up first the statements which Schmidtke rejects to observe later whether they are in any measure supported by those which he admits to be reliable.

In his *Panarion* (*Haer.* 30:16) Epiphanius has this to say about the writings current among the Ebionites:

> They have other Acts which they call those of the apostles, among which are many things filled with their impiety whence they have incidentally supplied themselves with arms against the truth. For they set forth certain Ascents and Instructions forsooth in the *Ascents of James,*

representing him as holding forth against both temple and sacrifices, and against the fire on the altar, and many other things filled with empty talk, so that they are not ashamed in them even to denounce Paul in certain invented utterances of the malignant and deceitful work of their false apostles.

The *Ascents* (or "*Steps*") *of James* (Ἀναβαθμοὶ Ἰακώβου) here referred to is traceable in the *Clementina* (*Rec.* I, 66–71). The section is justly recognized by Epiphanius as a product of Ebionite hatred of Paul. It related how James, accompanied by the Twelve Apostles and the whole church, mounted for seven successive days the highest steps (*ἀναβαθμοί*) of the temple, and there, disputing with Caiaphas, taught so convincingly that both high priest and people were ready for immediate acceptance of baptism. At the last moment, however, "the enemy" (Paul) intervened and stirred up the people against James and the apostles. He seized a firebrand from the altar, started a great massacre, and with his own hands flung down James from the top of the temple stairs.

In the form presented in the *Clementina* these *Ascents of James* are incomplete. They have been shorn of the polemic explicitly referred to by Epiphanius against temple, altar, and altar-fires. Schmidtke is probably right in assuming that the words "sed et de baptismate cum aliquanta dixisset" (*Rec.* I, 69) replace an argument conducted along the lines of *Rec.* I, 39, 48 that Jesus has superseded sacrifices by baptism and through its grace has extinguished the fires kindled on the altar by the high priest to atone for sins. We may probably ascribe to this polemic of James against Caiaphas the word which the Ebionites (according to Epiphanius) placed on the lips of Jesus in "what they call a gospel:"

> I came to abolish sacrificing, and if ye cease not from sacrificing wrath shall not cease from you.

There is also reason to hold that these "disputations of the twelve apostles in the temple" were prefaced by James's appeal to them to tell their experience when he received the challenge to debate from the high priest (*Rec.* I, 44). As Schmidtke views the matter the conception of the Twelve Apostles on seven successive days debating against the seven sects of Judaism was suggested to the writer of the *Clementina* by the story given by Hegesippus of the martyrdom of James, in which the martyr, before being summoned by the scribes and Pharisees to speak to the people from the pinnacle of the temple at Passover, had publicly disputed against these seven sects.

But we have already seen that Eusebius reports Hegesippus as using the *Ev. Hebr.* (*HE*, IV, xxii. 8). Priority is therefore on its side. We have also seen that the *Ascents of James* known to Epiphanius

was earlier than the Clementine romance, a writing of *c.* 210 which elaborates the theme with Peter as the hero. Must not even that very early writing which Irenaeus tells us was called "According to Matthew" and was alone current among the Ebionites have contained *something* corresponding to the *Ascents of James* with its glorification of James as supreme leader of the Church and its venomous attack upon Paul? May not the reference to its readers as "repudiating the Apostle Paul, calling him an apostate from the Law," be due to this same attack?

The objection is, of course, that the *Ev. Hebr.* was a brief writing, midway in length between Mt and Jn. Also that while later than Mt and Lk and dependent on them it was early enough to have retained a certain amount of genuine tradition from the apostolic body in Jerusalem, too early to have become deeply corrupted by the stream of Elkesaite and syncretistic Gnosticism. The question with which the enquirer for the origin of the title "According to Matthew" is concerned is whether those testimonies which from the very earliest times explicitly declare that the Ebionite apokryphon was called by some "According to Matthew," by others "the Gospel according to the Hebrews," by others still "the Gospel of the Twelve" can be reduced to a unity consistent with itself as well as with the known facts.

First of all it is quite apparent that a single writing of the length and character described cannot have contained the mass of late, legendary, and syncretistic material found by Epiphanius in use among the Ebionites of his time according to the following statement. (*Haer.* 30:23):

> They pretend to have received the names of the apostles for the persuasion of their dupes, and have composed fictitious books under their names, under the mask, forsooth, of James and Matthew and other disciples, among which names they even include that of the Apostle John, in order that their insanity may betray itself from every side; for he (John) convicts them in every way.

We recognize at once the *Ascents of James* as the first exhibit under this indictment, and also the title "According to Matthew." It is remarkable, however, that Epiphanius does not stop there but includes other apostles as introduced by name, specifically mentioning the Apostle John. Doubtless the "books" spoken of by Epiphanius (if he had any direct knowledge of them) will have stood as toward the primitive apokryphon in somewhat the same relation as the apostolic disputes of the *Clementina*. But whatever discounts should be made from the late and suspicious testimony of Epiphanius it is surely remarkable that he not only declares explicitly that the gospel

used by these Ebionites was the *Ev. Hebr.*, which was "named According to Matthew" although "garbled and mutilated," but that he specifies as the three apostolic names here misemployed just those three which we have particular reason to believe were indeed put forward in the *Ev. Hebr.* As regards James the Just and Matthew the reason is already apparent.[7] As regards the Apostle John, we have seen ground to believe that the reason the story of the Woman taken in Adultery (found by Eusebius in *Ev. Hebr.*) occupies the places chosen for it by transcribers of the canonical Gospels is the fact that in the *Ev. Hebr.* it was presented as a story related *by the Apostle John.*

But it is time that we turned from these admittedly dubious reports of Epiphanius to those which even Schmidtke admits to be based on real knowledge. The passage quoted in Chapter III (p. 44) is one of these. It is obviously based on Synoptic story, though it employs a late designation for the Sea of Gennesaret (*cf.* Jn 6:1 and 21:1) and in its description of the Baptist's food at the close makes verbal changes ("locusts" ἀκρίδες, to "oil-cakes" ἐγκρίδες) to meet the vegetarian rule of the Ebionites. Two more admittedly authentic extracts will help us to form a judgment regarding the perplexing composition.

In *Haer.* 30:13 Epiphanius gives a long extract from its "beginning":

> The beginning of the gospel current among them runs, "It came to pass in the days of Herod king of Judea that John came baptizing a baptism of repentance in the River Jordan, a man said to be a descendant of Aaron the priest, child of Zacharias and Elizabeth, and all went forth unto him."

Epiphanius repeats this freely in 30:14. He continues his statement in 30:13 as follows:

> And after saying a good many things he adds: "And when the people had been baptized Jesus also came and was baptized by John. And when he had come up from the water the heavens were opened and he saw the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove descending and entering into him. And there came a voice from heaven saying, Thou art my Son, the Beloved; my choice was fixed upon thee. And again, Today have I begotten thee. And immediately a great light shone round about the place. And John, when he saw it, saith unto him, Who art thou, Lord? And again there came a voice from heaven to him, This is my Son, the Beloved, on whom my choice was fixed. Thereupon (it says) John, doing him obeisance, said, I pray thee, Lord, do thou baptize me. But he prevented him saying, Suffer it, for thus it is fitting to fulfill all things.

[7] Above, p. 44.

A little further on (*Haer.* 30:16) Epiphanius reports the Ebionite writing "called a gospel" to have contained the logion already cited (p. 489), "I came to abolish sacrificing," etc., and in 30:22 quotes its parallel to Lk 22:15 as follows:

> They have changed the utterance and have represented the disciples as saying, "Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the Passover?" and him, forsooth, as saying, "Not with desire for flesh have I desired to eat this Passover with you."

Obviously, so far as extent is concerned, the writing was indeed a "gospel," or more exactly a Synopticon, covering the apostolic tradition from the baptism to the cross as defined in Acts 1:22 and 10:37–42. It cut off the infancy chapters including the (mutually irreconcilable) genealogies, as Epiphanius complains (*Haer.* 30:14), but much of the space thus saved was wasted in crude attempts to combine and harmonize Mt and Lk. How, then, was it possible to include in its narrow compass of 2,200 lines an extended account of the resurrection appearance to James (*cf.* I Cor. 15:7) and in addition false Acts of the Apostles, reporting as from Matthew and other disciples, including the Apostle John, sayings and doings of the Lord?

This question looks to the entire plan and make-up of the writing. To answer it we must employ not only the meager data supplied by the extant fragments and references, but a historic imagination which can put itself in the situation of a convinced Ebionite determined to vindicate the beliefs and traditions of this group of "zealots for the Law" (Acts 21:20). These, as we know, rallied to the standard of "James the Just" and not only rejected Paul, but regarded even the compromise of Peter at Antioch as "weak." What would a follower of James and the Twelve naturally have to say to make good the position of his church, in days when Synoptic tradition starting at Rome with "Reminiscences of Peter" had swept all before it in northern Syria by means of two independent combinations of Mk with S?

Obviously the tradition of the public ministry already current under the name of Peter could not be contradicted under the name of James. The most that could be done would be to repeat its general outline with occasional modification in the direction of Ebionism, and some harmonization to meet criticisms from the Jewish Synagogue. The only possible way to make room for Jacobean tradition was to *append, at the point left open by Lk, an apostolic commission to "Israel" delivered by the risen Christ to James and the Twelve*, in short another version of the Acts of the Apostles, in which not Peter, as in Lk's second "treatise," delivers the message but *James and the Twelve.*

This is exactly the significance of the most important, reliable, and

characteristic of all the fragments, the statement by Origen of how Jesus appeared after the resurrection to his brother James, instituting as the center of Christian ritual that new Passover to which the words of Lk 22:15 (in Ebionite version) had looked forward. Not Peter, who in two extant fragments (here and in the list of the Twelve) is subordinated, but James, is here made the foundation of the Church, a believer whose indomitable faith, unshaken by the despair of the rest, is rewarded by the first appearance of the risen Lord. The story of Mt 26:47–51; 27:57–60, 62–66; 28:11–15 is presupposed; but a new continuation is furnished departing as widely from Mt's brief account of the Apostolic Commission given in Galilee (Mt 28:16–20) as from Lk's story in Acts.

The evidence, such as it is, from the *Ascents of James* and the *Clementina* is strongly corroborated by what we learn from independent sources of the further course of the story. In Fragment 16 [8] (Schmidtke, p. 35) the speaker is manifestly James. He appears to be haranguing a mixed multitude ignorant of the story of Jesus, for they require to be told even the Redeemer's name as well as the opening scenes of his career, which had been already given in Fragment 15. In short James performs exactly the functions of Peter in Acts 1:12–2:40 and 10:36–43. The dependence of the Ebionite writer on Acts is made certain by his repetition of the list of the Twelve (including Judas Iscariot), just as Lk repeats it in Acts 1:13 f., but with substitution of "Matthew" (on the basis of Mt 9:9) in place of "Matthias" of Acts 1:23–26.

The further functions of "Peter *and John*" in Acts 3–5 are continued by James in what we have learned from Epiphanius' report of the *Ascents of James* concerning the further course of the story. Instead of the voiceless John who merely shadows Peter in Luke's story the author of the Ebionite "Acts" gave James the support of the whole apostolic group, probably naming John first, seeing he, with his brother James, heads the list in Fragment 16. This was of course necessary since the Twelve, and not James, had been Jesus' followers in Galilee. They had in fact been named by the Lord as his "witnesses to Israel." This structure of the apokryphon entailed that curious repetition which we note in the Fragments (*cf.* Fragments 15, 16, and 17), as the successive pairs of apostles offered their "witness"; but it served the important end of voicing those "traditions of the Elders" which Jerusalem early in the second century could still report (*cf.* Irenaeus, *Haer.* V, xxxiii. 3) *attaching them to the names of individual apostles*, specifically naming "John" and "Matthew," but not forgetting "Judas Iscariot" (Papias, Frgts. 3 and 12).

The particular tradition of the Apostles which Irenaeus gives in

[8] Quoted in our text, above, p. 44.

the passage above referred to is given explicitly as derived from "Papias," who gave it as a story related by "John the disciple of the Lord" transmitted by "the (Jerusalem) elders." It is at least a remarkable coincidence that Eusebius found another story concerning "a woman accused of many sins before the Lord" likewise related by Papias, but which was also "contained in the *Ev. Hebr.*," a story which from its attachment in nearly all our Mss. to the fourth Gospel was probably given there also as related by the Apostle John.

It is needless for our present purposes to pursue further these evidences that the Ebionite "gospel" did unite certain "acts of individual apostles" to its story of "the things that Jesus began to do and to teach." For an Ebionite writer of the age following the appearance of the Synoptic Gospels (including Acts) it was desirable to recast the story with certain harmonizations and adaptations. He would naturally "cut off the genealogies of Matthew" and restore the "beginning of the gospel" as it had been in Mk and in Petrine tradition (Acts 1:22; 10:37). Epiphanius informs us that he did so (*Haer.* 30:14). He would also naturally introduce changes to accommodate the statements of Mt and Lk to Ebionite vegetarianism and asceticism. The Fragments 16 and 19 show how he avoided the representation that either John or Jesus tasted flesh, Fragment 19 (this, however, coming more probably from the argument of James against the high priest) his polemic against sacrifice. Fragment 23 shows that Mt's account of the resurrection was felt to be still in need of re-enforcement.

But if Synoptic gospel tradition could be thought in need of improvement much more its sequel in Lk's second "treatise." Canonical Acts made the writing of "new Acts of the Apostles" an absolute necessity if Ebionite views were to stand. We need not assume, of course, that everything which Epiphanius found in his *Ascents of James* already formed part of the *Ev. Hebr.* Subsequent enlargements, including Gnostic versions such as the *Gospel of Judas Thomas*, or the Leucian *Acts of John* and other apostles, may well have seen the light between the Ebionite evangelist and Epiphanius. But Fragment 23 (Origen), with what may be inferred from the *Clementina*, from Epiphanius, and from the other data already cited, is enough to make it highly probable that the chief aim of the *Ev. Hebr.* was to meet the representation of Acts 1–15, where Peter is made both founder and leader of the Church, with another in better accord with Ebionite views.

As conceived by the Ebionites this entire development belonged properly to James and the original Twelve, the work of Paul being purely and simply that of an "enemy," a "renegade and apostate from the Law." Both parts of such a revised Lk-Acts might easily

be comprised within the compass of 2,200 *stichoi* Moreover Ebionites of 100–115 might well accept this as "the" Gospel, Alexandrians who became acquainted with it might easily designate it "The Gospel according to the Hebrews," excerpting some of its alleged logia. Even its legendary portrait of James the Just might have value in the eyes of Hegesippus and Origen in spite of its "venomous words against Paul." Why it might be christened in other quarters "According to the Twelve" or "According to Matthew" in days when no such claim had as yet been voiced for its canonical predecessor, we have already made clear. At least the title "According to Matthew" would appear to fit the apokryphon exactly. The canonical Mt it does not fit at all.[9]

[9] See further Appended Note X.

APPENDED NOTE VII

MATTHEAN GREEK AND THE N FACTOR

Our discussion of Scripture Quotations in S (Appended Note V) will have established the fact that the Hebraic factor which distinguishes the Greek of this Gospel is largely borrowed. Whether derived from some lost collection of *testimonia* or some annotated or targumistically expanded version of Mk its limited group of quotations based on the Hebrew text, quotations which have been appealed to since Jerome's day as proof that the work is as a whole a Greek rendering of the Aramaic writing of the Apostle Matthew, prove nothing of the kind. On the contrary the compiler of the work makes our own Greek Mk his almost exclusive dependence for his story, adds to this as his next most important source a compilation of the discourses of Jesus which, whatever its original language, was a Greek document when drawn upon in common by Mt and Lk, and in addition when quoting from the Old Testament on his own account uses uniformly the LXX version. Even when adding to a borrowed quotation which itself rests upon the Hebrew, as in Mt 12:17–20, the extension (verse 21) is taken from the LXX. This proves beyond reasonable doubt that the evangelist's own language, at least for literary purposes, was the same as that of the readers for whom he prepared the work, viz., Greek.

Nevertheless the Greek current in various localities of the Near East at successive periods and among different social groups has different characteristics. Both Lk and Mt improve upon the less refined Greek of Mk, both with a pronounced Jewish coloration, yet not the same. The Greek of Philo, Jewish philosopher of Alexandria, differs from that of Josephus, his later Palestinian contemporary. Nay, Josephus differs from himself, his earlier volume on the *Jewish War*, which had the advantage of revision by Greek rhetoricians (*Ctr. Apion* i. 9), being noticeably of better style than the later works prepared with less apparent dependence on such aid.

Much attention has therefore been given by critics and philologians to the distinctive Greek of Mt, most recently and systematically of all by A. Schlatter of Tübingen in his belated attempt to rescue the Tübingen theory of the priority of this Gospel. For Schlatter regards the Gospel as a Palestinian writing composed by the Apostle himself before the fall of Jerusalem. A copy of Schlatter's work entitled

Der Evangelist Matthäus; seine Sprache, sein Ziel, seine Selbständigkeit (Stuttgart, 1929), was secured by the present writer after his own work had already been sent to the printer, but not too late for attention in this and other Notes.

Schlatter holds that not only Matthew the Apostle but the rabbis of Palestine and the Palestinian church as well used Greek interchangeably with Aramaic, or even by preference, so that while Aramaic might be referred to in Acts 1:19 as "their language," and Josephus in his account of the siege of Jerusalem in 68–70 could repeatedly refer to Aramaic as the language of its inhabitants, a Gospel intended for more than local circulation might reasonably be composed in Greek. It is true that Claudius Lysias, the centurion who rescued Paul from the temple mob (Acts 21:37–40) expressed surprise that Paul is able to speak Greek, but in Schlatter's opinion Claudius Lysias did not appreciate the level of culture to which the Jerusalem church had now attained, nor the large proportion of Hellenistic Jews among its members.

Schlatter's evidence is drawn from a minute comparison of every clause of the Gospel from beginning to end with corresponding clauses of Josephus and from the Talmud. It becomes easily apparent that it is the Talmud, more especially the Babylonian Talmud, with which the Greek of Mt stands in closest affinity. Its Greek is exactly described in the term coined by R. Simon, *Grec de la Synagogue.* For not even Schlatter will venture in these days to claim an Aramaic original for Mt after the manner of Papias and his patristic satellites. Translation of the work as a whole is inadmissible for reasons already presented. But the evangelist, Hellenist in speech though he be, is certainly deeply imbued both with the spirit and the mode of expression of the rabbis.

What, then, is this school of rabbinic Judaism which has become so thoroughly Hellenized as to use by preference the Greek text of the Old Testament and show no further influence of Jewish origin than in the structure of sentences and choice of words? Should we look to Jerusalem as the birthplace of "Synagogue Greek" or to regions farther to the north and east?

It should be observed that the prejudice against Aramaic, which led the Palestinian Synagogue to forbid its use for some of the most sacred purposes and to employ as much as possible the original Hebrew, much as the Roman church today insists on the liturgical use of Latin, did not extend to Greek, the language of the civilized and cultured world. Greek translations of all the Scriptures had long since become indispensable. Greek-speaking Jews employed them in the Hellenistic cities of Palestine itself. Even the *Shemà* was recited in Greek in at least one synagogue of Caesarea Palestina, a half-

Jewish half-Syrian city, without serious objection from Jerusalem. The famous rabbinic family of Gamaliel was noted for its acquaintance with Greek literature. How much can be said for the possibility of a converted rabbi in Jerusalem using Greek as the medium in which to compose a Gospel may be seen by careful perusal of the opening section of Zahn's great *Introduction*. We must assume in that case, however, that the circle of readers for whom it was intended was not the mass of the population, with whom at the siege Titus could only communicate through an interpreter who spoke "their language," viz., Aramaic.

Conditions were not dissimilar in the districts inhabited by the Jews "from Mesopotamia" referred to in Acts 2:9. This was probably the larger and wealthier if not also the more influential branch of post-exilic Judaism. In the period of which we are speaking (40–95 A.D.) it had obtained the splendid accession of the royal family of Adiabene by missionary activity exerted both from lower Babylonia and from Palestine. The Babylonian Talmud remains as the permanent memorial of this eastern branch of Judaism. As in Palestine, Hebrew, though no longer a living language, was cultivated by the rabbis, while Aramaic in various dialects remained the language of the multitude. However in the centers of Seleucid culture Greek continued for centuries to be the official language, as the coinage of the cities shows.

The region of Osrhoene, whose capital was Edessa, in the westernmost bend of the Euphrates, is typical of the conditions which might be expected to give rise toward the close of the first Christian century to such a writing as Mt. The Gospel is composed in "Synagogue Greek," a type developed where populations of Jewish religion and descent were large, as in Euphratean Syria, where Greek culture still disputed the ground with Aramaic, and Syriac had not yet become the vehicle of Christian literature.

The *Dialogues* of Lucian, written at Samosata, capital of Commagene, in the latter half of the second century, exhibit the best Greek style since the classic period, and could not have become current without a considerable Greek-speaking population in this region, which bordered Osrhoene on the north. In fact Samosata lay but twenty miles to the north of Edessa on the Euphrates. Greek could certainly not have ceased to be the literary language of Edessa before 100 A.D. It was probably even the vernacular there for some decades later.

Next to Antioch Edessa was perhaps the oldest seat of Christianity in northern Syria. The Jewish population of the region offered an inviting mission field for evangelists from the western seaport and was doubtless largely Greek-speaking. Only the legend of King Abgar

serves to carry back its christianization beyond the opening of the second century, but influences from Antioch, bringing to Edessa the Roman Gospel of Mk and the S collection of the discourses of Jesus, would meet there a certain inheritance of Jewish tradition emanating not so much from Jerusalem as from Adiabene and the fertile plain of northern Arabia. Here "in the plains of Syria and all its cities" as far as Nisibis, where the wandering bishop Abercius found Christian entertainment in the latter part of the second century, believing himself to be "following the footsteps of Paul," perhaps alluding to the celebrated pool of Edessa with its sacred fish in his cryptic reference to "fish from the spring, gigantic, pure, which a holy virgin had caught" as the "food which faith set before him in all places," we may reasonably look for the conditions which could give rise to a writing in "Synagogue Greek" of the nature of Mt.

The elaborate and minute study of Schlatter merely confirms the verdict of many competent scholars much earlier pronounced. In the language of Allen (*ICC*, p. lxxxv):

> The Greek of the Gospel is not so full of Aramaisms and of harsh constructions due to translation from Aramaic as is the Greek of the second Gospel. Nor, on the other hand has it the Septuagintal and, so, Hebraic ring of the language of the third Gospel. It has rather the lack of distinction which characterizes any narrative compiled from previous sources by an editor who contents himself with dovetailing together rather than rewriting the sources before him.

The Hebraizing factor in Mt includes a further element besides the Semiticized Greek style. This consists of material borrowings of which the group of quotations based on the Hebrew Old Testament offer a conspicuous example. In our fifth Appended Note it has been shown that these cannot be drawn by the evangelist from his own knowledge of the Scriptures since he mistakes in several instances their derivation and in general uses not the Hebrew but the Greek text when quoting on his own account. It is also noteworthy to how disproportionately great an extent these proof-texts from the Hebrew are attached to (or indeed form the basis of) anecdotes typically rabbinic in their whole character. The stories of Jesus' birth and infancy in the Preamble, the Petrine Supplements of Book IV, and the apocryphal additions to the Epilogue have a character of their own besides the dependence of their Scripture quotations on the Hebrew text which justifies that treatment as a special class of material which they have received at the hands of many critics. For reasons already stated the designation N (Nazarene) has been applied to the group in the present work.

The question whether this N material should be regarded as com-

posed by the evangelist himself (R), though not, of course, without some employment of oral tradition, or as representing some written source incorporated by R without more drastic recasting than he has given, for example, to Mk, is not yet wholly settled. It is true that phraseology quite distinctive of R, such as the stereotyped formula introducing the proof-texts "that it might be fulfilled which was written" and the like, and the epithet "half-believer," is found in N, proving that R is reproducing more or less in his own words; but on the other hand the use of the Hebrew text and the individual character of the supplements go to prove a unity independent of R.

Burkitt, Harris, and Vacher Burch conceive this N material, particularly the quotations, to be derived from a collection of *testimonia* such as we know to have circulated in the second and third centuries, that is, proof-texts from Old Testament prophecy strung together for the convenience of preachers and writers of apologies. Others imagine a late expansion of the Markan record holding to it a relation not unlike that of *Ev. Naz.* to our own Mt. This theory would involve, of course, the same conception as Soltau's of a double redaction, with the difference that the work of R^n would precede that of R and be taken up in it.

Allen (p. liv.) divides the N element into incidents and quotations. The former include the stories of Jesus' birth and infancy (1:18–25; 2:1–23) and two Petrine supplements (14:28–31 and 17:24–27). The third Petrine supplement (Blessing of Peter, 16:17–19), is otherwise grouped by Allen.

Soltau (*Unsere Evangelien*, p. 55) gives the following as the narrative content of N:

1. The Birth Stories, Mt 1–2.
2. Three Petrine supplements; Walking on Sea, 14:28–31, 33, Blessing of Peter, 16:17–19, Temple-tax, 17:24–27.
3. Celibacy, 19:10–12.
4. Suicide of Judas, 27:3–10.
5. Features of the Trial; Pilate's Wife's Dream, 27:19, He Washes his hands of Guilt, 27:24 f., He Appoints a Guard for the Tomb, 27:62–66; 28:12–15.
6. Portents at Jesus' Death, 27:52 f.
7. Appearance to Mary Magdalen, 28:9–11.
8. Appearance to the Disciples in Galilee, 28:16–20.

The quotations, called *Reflexionscitate*, are intermingled with these supplements and are, according to Soltau, of R's own finding. Except in the genealogy he has only oral tradition as a source. Allen (pp. lx–lxii) concludes from a study of the quotations that it is "very unlikely" that they are due to the editor. The stories represent "a cycle of traditions," not "a document into which they had been

collected." The editor relies on the LXX, the stories on the Hebrew text.

The difficulties in the way of supposing N to be the personal composition of R are not small. Some have already been noted. Soltau's theory requires us to believe in the currency of a Proto-Mt which enjoyed one, or even two decades of wide acceptance in the Greek-speaking Church, including employment by Lk (*Unsere Evangelien*, p. 81). But most inexplicably this broader, more universalistic form of Mt, characterized by better Greek no less than by greater antiquity and higher moral quality, was discarded *by the Greek-speaking, Gentile Church* in favor of the Hebraizing substitute, presumably for the sake of the few apocryphal supplements and the legendary and midrashic Preamble. This is hardly credible. It is true that the post-apostolic age witnessed the growth of Infancy gospels and apocryphal tales attaching specially to the Passion and Resurrection; but these did not *displace* the canonical, they only aimed to fill apparent gaps. Once the blend of Mk and S which Soltau posits as his Proto-Mt had attained such standing as he supposes, its disappearance without trace is highly improbable.

Again it is admitted on both sides that N has a certain unity of substance as well as form, not enough in Allen's opinion to warrant our speaking of it as a document, but only as a "cycle of traditions." Soltau, after an exhaustive study of its distinctive vocabulary, style and motive, is convinced that it represents a Jewish-christian *milieu* and late date. The explanation offered in the present Studies connects Reflexionscitate and rabbinic supplements under a single head. Like the "Synagogue Greek" of R they are derived from a Jewish-christian *milieu* of catholic sympathies like those of the Nazarenes of Aleppo.

In some districts, as the Aramaic Gospels show, these communities retained their Semitic speech, in others they had employed the Greek language even before the invasion of Christianity, and of course continued to use it after their conversion and the circulation among them of the Gospel of Mk side by side with S in its Greek dress. The Gospel of Mk would of course be targumed in churches whose speech was Aramaic just as the Old Testament had been in days of Jewish faith, and these targums of Mk would be supplemented, whether in oral or written form, with just such explanatory and edifying expansions as the Jewish Targums exhibit. The proof that Mt itself underwent such a process is supplied by the extant fragments of *Ev. Naz.* Before the composition of Mt we may reasonably assume that in some districts of Osrhoene its predecessor Mk had received similar treatment. After the advent of first the Greek, then the Aramaic Mt the targumed Mk, so immeasurably inferior from the standpoint of that age, would inevitably disappear and be wholly forgotten. Neverthe-

less some of its more cherished elements, such as the birth stories, the apologetic supplements to the Markan account of finding the Empty Tomb, and the Scripture fulfilments, would survive. Taken up in oral or written form into the Greek Mt by a translation which did not wholly obliterate the dependence of their citations on the Hebrew text they would still be recognizable to critics possessing the Greek Mk as "parasitic," and that not upon the stem of Mt, to which they are now attached, but upon the stem of Mk. In Streeter's words "they stand to Mk as the mistletoe to the oak."

It is this same able critic who gives us (*FG*, p. 503) the following well-conceived account of Mt's additions to the Passion story, which as he notes have the same nature as the Petrine supplements of Book IV, being "embellishments of the Marcan account which presuppose Mk as their basis."

> It is noteworthy that not a single one of them looks like a genuine historical tradition; while some of them are clearly legendary, *e.g.*, the temporary resurrection of saints in Jerusalem at the time of the Rending of the Veil, or Pilate's washing his hands before the multitude—an action as probable in a Roman governor as in a British civil servant in India. The commonest device of the preacher or Sunday School teacher who wishes to bring an incident of Scripture vividly before the minds of his audience is to retell the story with little additions derived from his own imaginative reconstruction of the scene. This kind of thing was familiar to the Rabbis in the popular exposition of the Old Testament, so much so that it has a technical name, "Haggada." The additions which Mt makes to Mk's Story of the Passion are precisely analogous to the Rabbinic Haggada of Old Testament stories. It is improbable that the editor of Mt made them up himself; rather they represent the "happy thoughts" of a long series of preachers and teachers. Those which happened to "catch on" would be remembered; in the course of time their "Haggadic" origins would be forgotten and they would be accepted as authentic traditions. But if this is so Mk must have been known in the Church where Mt wrote long enough to have become an established authority—a document which preachers and teachers expounded by methods familiar in the exposition of Scripture.

Streeter estimates the interval of time necessary for this development between the appearance of Mk and the composition of Mt at ten years as "an absolute minimum," while "twenty would be none too many." Fifteen would seem a reasonable estimate. For reasons detailed in our text we regard the region toward Euphratean Syria with its many Greek-speaking cities from Apamea to Samosata, a region to which Edessa with its very early Christianization would be central, as that to which we should look for the origin of Mt rather than Antioch as assumed by Streeter.

Mt's dependence upon Mk is firmly established. Schlatter's hope-

less insistence upon the contrary relation is scarcely worthy the name of argument. Its effect upon any competent judge can only be that of Hengstenberg's apologetic for the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch upon Colenso. We may take as an example Schlatter's explanation (p. 462) of the oversight of Mt 14:12 in transcribing Mk 6:29 f. The story is introduced at verse 3 precisely as in Mk 6:17 as a *parenthetic* explanation of Herod's comment on hearing of the miracles of Jesus. Herod at some previous time not defined *had* beheaded John in prison. Mk thereupon digresses after his not infrequent manner to relate the tragedy. He drops entirely after this digression the thread of Herod and his attitude toward Jesus and resumes only with the sequel to the Mission of the Twelve which he had inserted between the account of Jesus' Miracles and Herod's Comment. The consequence is that the reader not sufficiently on his guard against Mk's digressive style is apt to take the sequel to the Mission of the Twelve in Mk 6:30 as if it were the sequel to the Beheading of John.

This is what actually happens in Mt's transcription. Forgetting that he had begun the story as a parenthesis Mt omits the closing and continues as if Jesus' retirement to the lake-shore with the Twelve were the immediate consequence of the tragedy. Thus *John's* disciples, who according to Mk 6:29 "came and took up his body and laid it in a tomb," become identified with *Jesus'* disciples, who according to the next verse "gathered together unto Jesus and reported to him all that they had done and taught." In Mt 14:12 this is all run together as follows: "And his (John's) disciples came near and took up his body and came and reported to Jesus." Then follows the retirement to the lake-shore. Schlatter has no further comment to make upon this transcriptional error than merely to remark that "Mk has removed the connection of the boat-journey into the wilderness with the execution of the Baptist." Mt's partial correction of Mk's historical inaccuracies regarding Herod's position and family is equally disregarded by Schlatter.

This scholar's attempt to make the Petrine supplements of Mt 14:28–33; 16:16b–19; 17:24–27, and 18:21 appear to be intentional *omissions* on the part of Mk is equally feeble. Schlatter treats these as a group on p. 470. Admitting that if 16:16b–19 stood alone it might be considered to be an attempted enhancement of the authority of Peter, Schlatter holds that *as a group* the passages cannot be so taken, and have been omitted by Mk as irrelevant or unflattering to the great apostle!

After reasoning of this kind it is not surprising to find the evidences of Matthean revision in the story of the Rich Enquirer (19:16–30 = Mk 10:17–31), Request of the Sons of Zebedee (20:20–28 = Mk 10:35–45), etc., and of supplementation in the Passion story either ig-

nored by Schlatter or unconvincingly explained away. We transcribe only his explanation of Mk's omission [*sic*] of the following group of episodes in P^{mt}: Judas' Suicide (27:3–11a), Pilate's Wife's Dream (27:19); Pilate's Washing his Hands (27:24 f.); the quotation of Ps. 69:22 in 27:35; the Earthquake and temporary Resurrection (27:51b–53) and the Watch at the Sepulchre (27:62–66; 28:11–15). On p. 791 Schlatter explains why these interesting proofs of the Passion and Resurrection fail to appear in Mk:

> All these passages have a common aim; they set forth the part taken by Jerusalem in the death of Jesus and lay bare its guilt. May not the same consideration account for their removal by Mk which induced him to pass over the sayings in condemnation of Pharisaism and the threatening parables? But it is apparent that this material is not of later origin than Mk, that in Mk also Pilate makes two attempts to release Jesus rather than Barabbas although the warning from Pilate's wife is wanting in Mk; also that one of the witnesses who speaks in Jesus' behalf also appears in Mk, although this evangelist fails to make it clear how the centurion at the cross comes to his acknowledgment that Jesus is a Son of God. Mk says ἰδὼν ὅτι οὕτως ἐξέπνευσεν (" seeing that he thus expired "), but nothing had been related to suggest divine sonship in any way unless we revert to the darkness which lasted till Jesus' death which is not included in Mk's arrangement of the sentence. We can understand, therefore, why Lk did not take over this clause of Mk without change. Lk 23:47 ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ ἑκατοντάρχης τὸ γενόμενον (" the centurion seeing what had happened ") restates Mt 27:54 and the confession ὄντως ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος ἦν (" truly this was a righteous man ") is adjusted to what might be expected from an officer who only saw Jesus' end unaccompanied by miraculous occurrences.

It is hard to realize that the above can be seriously offered as a valid explanation of the non-appearance in Mk of the Passion-story supplements of Mt. When it is added that this is *all* that Schlatter advances in behalf of his paradoxical contention, the reader will appreciate why to our own judgment there can be no more forceful demonstration of the priority of Mk than the pleas raised against it by its few surviving opponents.

APPENDED NOTE VIII

THE FOUR-DOCUMENT HYPOTHESIS

At least from the standpoint of Studies in Mt the most important chapter in Canon Streeter's able volume *FG* is that entitled "A Four-document Hypothesis" (Ch. IX). With the method and theory here laid down we have been compelled to take issue. Difference as regards method was expressed in the chapter (Pt. I, Ch. IX) discussing the material peculiar to Mt (P^{mt}); as regards application it was expressed in the Special Introduction to Book I (Pt. II, Ch. XII).

It is manifest that Canon Streeter regards the hypothesis he here advances as his most original contribution to Synoptic criticism, for he professes to "formulate a new principle of Synoptic criticism," which he states as follows (p. 224):

> Wherever parallel passages of Mt and Lk show substantial divergence, editorial modification is a less probable explanation than conflation by Mt of the language of Q with that of some other version.

As respects principle and application alike Canon Streeter is justified in claiming originality. In fact he has a better claim to it on this score than on that whereon his claims are widely supposed to rest; for as students of the Synoptic problem do not need to be told, the views expressed in his *Hibbert Journal* article (1921) and restated in the chapter entitled "Proto-Luke" in *FG* (Ch. VIII, pp. 201–222) advance but little those published by Paul Feine in his *Eine Vorkanonische Überlieferung des Lukas in Evangelium und Apostelgeschichte* (1891), and since that date accepted (so far as the doctrine of a "Proto-Luke" is concerned) by many of our leading German and English critics.[1] Canon Streeter's chief contribution to the Proto-Lk theory is the dubious identification of the author of L with Luke the companion of Paul.

Great impetus has undoubtedly been given by Streeter's advocacy to the theory of L (accepted since 1900 by the present writer; *cf. INT*, pp. 214 ff.). The preceding wide adoption of it, however, is sufficient disproof of the charge (*FG*, p. 227) that critics had been guilty of

> the unconscious assumption that they (Mt and Lk) used no other documents, or at least, none of anything like the same value as the "Big Two."

[1] Most of these use the designation L for the document in question. Vernon Bartlet prefers S (Special Source). For the bibliography see V. Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel*, 1926, pp. 1–22.

Canon Streeter confesses that he was himself "for many years a victim to this illusion." Others may decline with thanks to be included in this confession.

In view of the success attending his advocacy of the Proto-Lk theory it was natural that Canon Streeter should seek to merit more fully the title of originator by extending the same hypothesis to Mt. What we have now to ask is how far a theory of Proto-Mt [in which B. Weiss, *Quellen der Synopt. Lit.*, 1908, pp. 1–96 and Soltau (*op. cit.*) will have been Streeter's most important, if not his only predecessors] is supported by the available data.

The factors concerned in our problem are seven in number, whose symbols may be arranged in alphabetical order centering upon P, that is, material peculiar to Mt. By a curious coincidence the measure of our agreement with Streeter corresponds with this order M N O P Q R S, the central P representing the maximum, the extremities M and S the minimum of agreement. For while the present writer, as indicated in Chapters IX and XII finds no compelling reason to admit any Proto-Mt of the type designated M by Streeter, Canon Streeter finds no reason at all to admit a Second Source S, finding the symbol Q sufficient to cover all the data. Since, then, the P element is undisputed it remains to compare the respective valuations of the four factors N, O, Q, and R. We may take these in reverse order.

(1) The factor R. It has been one of the principal objects of the foregoing studies to demonstrate that the "new principle" proposed by Streeter (see above, p. 505) is a step backward rather than forward in Synoptic criticism. The appeal to Mt's treatment of Mk is fallacious, because at the points where the parallels show wide divergence Streeter denies the dependence. Thus we have shown reason to believe that Mt 13:24–30, often called the Parable of the Tares, is nothing more than a free recast of Mk 4:26–29, the Parable of the Patient Husbandman, whose place it occupies. The proof of manipulation by R^{mt} rather than derivation from an independent document lies in the special interest dictating the changes plus the characteristic phraseology particularly recognizable in the appended Interpretation (verses 36–43). Similar reasoning from motive and phraseology indicates the hand of R^{mt} again in many of the wide divergences in Q material, for example the added Beatitudes in Mt 5:4, 7–9. Only by adopting in advance a theory of transcription altogether too mechanical to fit the evidences of free, memoriter employment of the chief sources, and then excluding from consideration passages which display free divergence, does it become possible to accept the "new principle" laid down as to the relative probability of editorial modification vs. "some other version."

(2) The factor Q. We must refer the reader again to our Preface (pp. vi, xi) for a demonstration that identification of Q (defined as "coincident non-Markan material of Mt and Lk) with S (defined as the Source whence the Q material has been drawn) leads to hopeless ambiguity and confusion. Streeter's assumption that Q=S, followed by more or less successful attempts to find room in Q for P material, leads only to worse entanglement of the sources and paves the way for subjective judgments as to their nature.

(3) The factor O. Streeter makes unwarranted extension of this factor to cover the inconvenient Infancy chapters (Mt 1–2). The infancy stories are too obviously out of harmony with the other material classed under M to form part of the same document; Streeter therefore refers them to "oral tradition" (p. 266). But it has been shown above (p. 136) that Mt 1:1–11 is an adaptation of the Greek text of I Chr. 2:1–15; 3:10–17, whereas verses 12–16 must in the nature of the case be derived from an unknown document, or else from a type of oral tradition so fixed and stereotyped as to be practically indistinguishable from a document. Proceeding further it was shown that 1:18–25 must be at least in part from the pen of R because in verses 22 f. he again uses the LXX; whereas the rest of the paragraph (which in verse 21 implies familiarity on the readers' part with the Hebrew meaning of the name *Jesus*), and all the rest of the infancy section (ch. 2), is conspicuously characterized by its use of quotations from the Hebrew. This method of quotation differs so completely from the usage of Mk, Lk, and R himself that derivation from a *written* source, a source traceable at other points similarly characterized throughout the Gospel, is a practically unavoidable inference. We therefore reject the designation O in application to these sections and apply the designation N.

(4) The factor N. The characteristics of the N supplements, of which Streeter himself remarks (p. 502), "They stand to Mk as the mistletoe to the oak" is such as to warrant the inference that Mk had already been targumed for use in the Aramaic-speaking (Nazarene) church which afterwards targumed Mt (=*Ev. Naz.*=τὸ Ἰουδαικόν); and that these additions (including the "Petrine supplements) are derived by Mt from this Aramaic targum of Mk. Streeter's remarks about "Rabbinic Haggada" as applied to these supplements are entirely appropriate, but they do not remove, they only confirm, the inference we have made from the use of the Hebrew text, that R found them not in oral but in *written* form.

We are thus brought back to the question from which we started, Is there evidence to warrant the the hypothesis of a Proto-Mt (M)? In the text evidence has been adduced to prove that R^{mt} does not follow the mosaic style of the *Diatessaron;* neither does he limit him-

self to that "method of conflation" which Streeter describes as typical of him on pp. 246–249. Streeter's comments on the selected passages are judicious, but their value toward determining the method of R^{mt} is almost nullified by the fact of *selection*. For the passages which militate against the "new principle" have been excluded in advance. Now R^{mt} undoubtedly does "conflate," as the selections show; but he can *also* completely rewrite when occasion requires. It is for the critic to recognize from admitted characteristics such as eschatology, anti-scribal animus, hostility to the "teachers and workers of *ἀνομία*," what occasions Mt would regard as calling for revision.

The strongest plea which can be made for an M theory is based on the phenomena of the great Sermon of Book I. Here R^{mt} is admitted to have strung together an agglutination of Q sections after a plan of his own within the framework of a discourse on Filial Righteousness which began with Beatitudes and ended with the parable of the Well-founded Building.

The displaced Q material affords no difficulty, it is only the P material which concerns us. Of this material peculiar to Mt employed by R beyond the limits of Lk's parallel (Lk 6:20–49) the larger part is accounted for to the satisfaction of many critics, including the judicious Sir John Hawkins, by Lukan omission. According to these critics the substance of the Antitheses of New Law and Old (Mt 5:21–48) stands in its original place in S, Lk having merely omitted the negative side to expand somewhat the positive (Mt 5:39–42, 44–48 = Lk 6:27–36). Streeter holds (p. 251):

> that Mt is conflating two separate discourses, one from Q practically identical with Lk's Sermon on the Plain, the other from M containing a much longer Sermon.

The "practical identity" of the Lukan version with the S original is an inference based on the assumption that R^{lk} abstained from any considerable alteration, and that the same applies to Proto-Lk from whom Lk draws. Similar limitation of the freedom of R^{mt} is implied in the statement (p. 250):

> The Sermons in Mt and Lk can be derived from a single written source only if we postulate an almost incredible amount of editorial freedom in rewriting portions of the original.

The real difficulty for those unwilling to grant such limitations as Streeter would impose on the editorial freedom of R^{mt} is that there do superficially appear to be *two strata* of redaction in this portion of the Sermon, implying another hand (M?) between the Q form known to Lk and the present redaction (R^{mt}). In our discussion of the

question (pp. 123, 130, 176 ff.) effort has been given to do full justice to this difficulty by observing (p. 181) that "the literary symmetry is disregarded in both divisions (Mt 5:21–48 and 6:1–18) by R^{mt} and is therefore not likely to be his own work." The inference would naturally be that the disappearance of this literary symmetry in Lk's version of Mt 5:21–48 is due to abbreviation by L or R^{lk}, while the addition of 6:1–18 (Righteousness of the Scribes) is simply another of R^{mt}'s supplements from S which would have appeared as Q had Lk thought it worth taking up. In both cases the interpolated matter (5:23 f. = O, 25 f. = Lk 12:57–59, 29 f. = Mk 9:43–48, 34b–36 = O, and 6:9–13 = Lk 11:2–4) is inserted by R^{mt}, to whom we must also ascribe the links of attachment 6:1, 7 f. and 14 f. Thus the apparent two strata of redaction are not really two. Lk has omitted some of the Antitheses, which R^{mt} contrariwise has expanded by a series of interpolations, largely Q passages from other contexts. He has obscured the connection (preserved in Lk) between 5:43–48 and 7:1–5 by the long section of interpolated material in ch. 6, of which 6:2–6, 16–18 alone remains unaccounted for. By symmetry of form and worthiness of content these nine verses should be from the Second Source. Only the disruptive placing of the paragraph and the fact that it does not appear in Lk, stand in the way of our ascribing it to the same document as the mass of Q material with which R^{mt} has filled up the rest of ch. 6. The disruptive placing forms no more of an obstacle in this case than in all the other Q passages which R^{mt} has interjected throughout these two chapters. The fact that he has spoiled the rhetorical symmetry of the S original by his interpolations is exactly paralleled by his interpolations in 5:21–48.

There remains accordingly no further obstacle to the explanation of Mt's New Torah section (5:21–6:18) on the following basis: R^{mt} found in S the discourse on Filial Righteousness substantially as in Lk 6:20–49 but unmutilated by omission of the negative side of the Antitheses which Lk (or L) may have regarded as affronting the Commandments given at Sinai. R^{mt}, to complete what he regarded as a condemnation of the Righteousness of the Pharisees, added from some portion of S no longer extant, a condemnation of the Righteousness of the scribes, an authentic teaching of Jesus based on the same principle of Inwardness as the discourse on Filial Righteousness but given on another occasion (such as Mk 12:38–40?). Finally he interjected at various points in both parts of the discourse the passages indicated as interpolated, mainly displaced Q material, but some of it derived from oral sources. Having thus completed his outline of Christian Righteousness over against that of the Synagogue, not forgetting to add a long Q section on Reward in Heaven (6:19–34 = Lk 12:33 f.; 11:34–36; 16:13; 12:22–31), he continued the S^q discourse

on Filial Righteousness from the point of interruption in 7:1–5 = Lk 6:37 f., 41 f.

In all this it does not appear that we have any compelling occasion to introduce another edition of the Sermon (McNeile), far less an entire Proto-Mt (Streeter). Neither do we need to ascribe to R^{mt} any method of procedure other than we have found exemplified repeatedly in other portions of the Gospel. The symbol M is not required in the source-analysis of Mt as we conceive it.

APPENDED NOTE IX

THE LEAVEN OF THE PHARISEES

From the variety of form and diversity of context in which our evangelists report the warning of Jesus against the spirit of Pharisaism it is apparent that they no longer possessed the key to its original application. We ourselves may indeed be unable to restore it; but for the problem of transmission, that indispensable search for the environment and motives of the evangelists themselves, it should prove instructive to investigate the nature and significance of those later forms and settings in which we now find it. These settings and adaptations, which cannot all be correct, should throw some light upon the historical conditions reflected respectively by Mt, Mk, and Lk.

To determine the greater or less originality of the three different forms of the text we need only apply the classic principle *brevior lectio preferenda*, together with its later, more refined development: Prefer that form which can best account for the variants. Lk 12:1 gives altogether the briefest and simplest form of the logion: προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων "Be on your guard against the leaven of the Pharisees." This would appear to be the form in which it appeared in the Second Source, for both the preceding and the following context of Lk 11 and 12 consists of a great mass of Q material. Both Mk 8:14–21 and Mt 16:5–12, which here follows very closely the Markan source, extend the logion and also attach an elaborate explanation. We may therefore infer with practical certainty that the simple Lukan form, warning against Pharisaism alone, without either the Markan addition καὶ τῆς ζύμης Ἡρῴδου ("and the leaven of Herod") or the Matthean καὶ Σαδδουκαίων ("and of the Sadducees"), is the original; for in addition to brevity this form supplies an explanation of the additions.

The additions are typical. Mk considers the conspiracy of the Pharisees with the Herodians first mentioned in 3:6 and ultimately in 12:13 to be the chief danger to Jesus' life. In my article in *JBL* (XXXIX, Dec., 1920) entitled "Pharisees and Herodians in Mark" I endeavored to show that Mk's peculiar development of an earlier reference to the Warning against Herod (Antipas) brought to Jesus by the Pharisees (Lk 13:31) into an actual plot against his life concocted by "Pharisees and Herodians" is due to his knowledge of the formidable danger to the infant Church arising from the alliance of Herod *Agrippa* with the Pharisees to extirpate Christianity. Before

41 A.D. such an alliance appears highly improbable. Agrippa's policy of "pleasing the Jews" by persecuting the Church gives meaning to the phrase "Pharisees and Herodians." However this may be, the addition of Mk to the logion making it read "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees *and of the leaven of Herod*" is easily accounted for if the original appeared obscure. Mk's idea is that the warning refers to the plots against Jesus' life to which he had referred in 3:6. The long explanatory supplement of 8:16–21, certainly editorial because it combines references to both versions of the miracle of the Loaves, winds up with the reproachful "Do ye not yet understand?" Clearly Mk feels that two such miracles as these should have sufficed to convince the Twelve of the impotence of Jesus' foes to frustrate his work.

Mt takes over with his usual slight verbal abbreviation Mk's long explanatory supplement, but with a considerable difference as regards the nature of the danger. The disciples are to "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees *and Sadducees*." This addition also is typical. "Pharisees and Sadducees" is an expression used several times in Mt to cover the unbelieving elements of Israel. In 3:7 it takes the place of the simple "multitudes" of Lk 3:7 as the target of the Baptist's epithet "Ye generation of vipers," in 16:1 it takes the place of an indefinite "others" in Lk 11:16, for which Mk 8:11 gives only "the Pharisees" to designate the skeptics who demand a sign from heaven. Clearly the danger apprehended by Mt is Jewish unbelief in general, of which the Pharisees, but also and especially the worldly and skeptical Sadducees, are representative. The addition in 16:5 is therefore exactly what we might expect from Mt if he was perplexed by the logion in its simple form and dissatisfied with the explanation of Mk. To make his own improvement and its meaning quite unmistakable he makes a characteristic change in the final clause of the paragraph. Instead of Mk's reproachful "Do ye not yet understand?" Mt has the following:

> Then they understood that he was not bidding them beware of the *leaven* of the Pharisees and Sadducees but of the *teaching* of the Pharisees and Sadducees.

The difficulty with the original brief logion which leads first Mk, then Mt after Mk, to extend and interpret it is equally experienced by Lk. For the explanatory clause attached after it in Lk 12:1 "which is hypocrisy" is even less satisfactory than the changes of Mk and Mt. If there is any vice to whose subtle invasions the disciples were *not* exposed it is that kind of hypocrisy which all our evangelists regard as typical of Pharisaism. True, the Talmud itself notes six varieties of unworthy Pharisees to be distinguished from the seventh and only true Pharisee, who yields obedience to the Torah "because he loves

it." Among the unworthy are some who might fairly be compared to the "whited sepulchre" of gospel tradition. But better knowledge of what Pharisaism really was, a knowledge based largely on Jewish sources and less colored by bitter polemic than the representation transmitted through New Testament channels, makes us realize that the ecclesiastical portrait does justice neither to the Pharisees nor to the real ground of Jesus' opposition to them.

It cannot be denied that the epithet "hypocrite" emanates from Jesus himself. Without basis in his own utterance this harsh designation could not have passed into the later vocabulary of his followers to such a degree and with such application as we find in Mt and the *Didaché*. It is quite undeniable that the application of Is. 29:13 to the distinctive practices of Pharisaism with the epithet "Ye hypocrites" (Mk 7:6–8) is due to Jesus himself.

But the connotations which render the term most offensive to us are of later origin. Its basic sense, of course, is simply "play-actor." Jesus employs the term "play-acting" to distinguish the sort of right conduct which springs from any other interest than simple devotion to goodness for its own sake. His rejection of good works performed for ulterior motives of desire or fear is closely akin to that high definition of true Pharisaism already quoted from rabbinic sources, and both utterances are elicited by the same unfortunate tendency inseparable from all morality of the legalistic type based upon sanctions of reward and penalty. The divine Judge "looketh not upon the outward man but upon the heart," the legalistic ethic sets a premium upon the mask.

Our discussion of "Jesus and the Law" (Pt. IV, Theme I) should make clear the real point at issue. In the discourse on Filial Righteousness the essential characteristic of that which may justly be so called is its spontaneity. Just as a good tree produces good fruit as a consequence of its inward nature so with the truly good man. His reward is that he "becomes a son of his Father." He has as little thought as the Samaritan in the parable of accumulating a store of good works. He acts on the impulse of native disposition. Accounted a bastard by the sons of Abraham according to the flesh his action proves him one of the "sons of the Highest."

Conversely the evil disposition produces evil conduct as naturally and inevitably as the tree spoiled at the root. Good works may appear, as men attach gifts and ornaments to the branches of trees cut for Yule-tide merry-making; but their attachment is artificial. They are not the natural product of the tree and have no continuance. So with the "righteousness" of any legalistic system. Good conduct based on ulterior motives has but a sand foundation. It must be the spontaneous, inevitable, disinterested fruit of a "goodness" like that

of the all-Father; otherwise it has no real life in it, it is detached from the root, it is "play-acting."

Jesus applies the term "hypocrite" to the typical Pharisee in spite of the many Pharisees like the rich youth whom he "looked upon and loved" for his obedience to the Law. He does so for the reason that the system *as a whole* tends to just such evils as the six enumerated in the rabbinic saying. It offers ulterior motives for right conduct. By just so much as this wrong motivation becomes effective it cuts right conduct off from its proper root. Had the legalism of the Synagogue really tended to produce obedience to the divine ideal "from love of it" neither Jesus nor Paul would have broken with Pharisaism. That which it and all other systems of *quid pro quo* ethics tend really to produce may not deserve all the obloquy which attaches to the term "hypocrite" as moderns employ it, but in contrast with the filial righteousness Jesus describes what it tends to produce does deserve to be called "play-acting."

But Separatism, by which the term Pharisaism may be literally translated, is by its very nature attended by certain other more subtle besetting sins, which Jesus found abundant occasion to rebuke. That of self-righteousness is pilloried forever in the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican. Intolerance and exclusiveness were the faults of these representatives of Synagogue orthodoxy against which Jesus had most frequently to contend. In the general connection of the Exile Section of Mk, on occasion of sayings concerned with the Galilean Eucharist, we should expect a warning of Jesus against "the leaven of the Pharisees" to be directed against that aspect of Pharisaism to which his own disciples would inevitably be tempted, and in later days were indeed most dangerously exposed, I mean the disposition to intolerance and exclusiveness, especially in the matter of ritual purity.

From our interpretation of the term "hypocrisy" as applied by Jesus to Pharisaism, an interpretation based upon his most fundamental principles concerning conduct, we return, then, to the question of the warning. When will it have been appropriate for Jesus to put his disciples on their guard against the subtle inclination to take the Pharisee's point of view? Obviously when circumstances most strongly impelled toward conformity to the moral and religious conventions of Pharisaism instead of that independence of reason and conscience exercised by their Master. Hence we may infer in a general way that our three evangelists are substantially right in their placing of the logion. A warning against the subtle, unconscious influence of Pharisaism (such is the nature of the influence implied in the comparison to leaven) would be peculiarly appropriate in a context whose starting point was the attempt of the Pharisees jointly with a delegation of "scribes from Jerusalem" to impose their own standard of

"purity" on Jesus and his disciples. Somewhere in the connection of Mk 7:1 ff. = Mt 15:1 ff. or Lk 11:14 ff. Jesus might very well have uttered such a warning, for it was only too easy to foresee that they would find it difficult indeed to "stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ had set them free" by his example of courageous appeal to conscience.

But it is only in a very general way that Lk, Mk, and Mt agree to place the logion somewhere in the connection of the controversy over Things "Clean" and "Unclean." The immediate connection differs as between Lk and Mk-Mt but in neither case does it indicate a perception of the real meaning of the logion if our conception of it is correct.

In Lk 12:1 the logion serves as a link connecting the series of Exhortations to Fearless Confession of 12:2–12 with the long denunciation of Pharisees and scribes of 11:37–54. This latter recalls indeed by its occasion Mk's account of the controversy over Things "Clean" and "Unclean," for in both cases Jesus is taken to task by the same parties for disregarding the ablutions before eating; but the only point of coincidence in the long harangue which follows on both sides is the saying on Inward Cleanness (Lk 11:40 f. = Mt 23:25 f.), which Mk 7:14–23 elaborately develops and interprets, not forgetting the comment corresponding to Lk 11:41 = Mt 23:26 that the teaching "made all meats clean." There is enough resemblance to justify the inference that Mk and Q are here reporting the same collision, but verbal resemblance is almost wholly absent. Lk attaches at this point (11:42–52) the series of Woes on Scribes and Pharisees connected by Mt with Mk 12:38–40 as part of the final utterance of doom upon Jerusalem. This earlier setting is doubtless due to the just reflection that the Galilean opponents of Jesus, who drove him by their machinations from the scenes of his earlier ministry were the Pharisees and their allies the scribes from Jerusalem, whereas in Judea the group included as its leading element the Sadducean priesthood.

The altercation continues in Lk 11:53 f. with a description of the hostile pressure of the scribes and Pharisees, and in 12:1 of the great popular concourse. Coming as a sequel to this description of the plotting of these enemies of Jesus, who "laid wait for him to catch something out of his mouth" and prefacing the Exhortations to Fearless Confession, the logion is clearly taken by Lk to refer to the hidden wickedness of the conspirators. Either he takes a view of it similar to Mk's, making the warning apply to the secret machinations of the Pharisees, which however carefully "covered up" will ultimately "be revealed" (verse 2), in which case the addition "which is hypocrisy" might be due to a later hand; or else he assumes, however strangely, that the disciples need to guard against the temptation to

similar "hypocrisy!" Neither application is easily credible. If Jesus had been desirous of putting his disciples on their guard against the conspirators he would hardly have used such cryptic language. If he wished to encourage them to be open and bold in confession the example of the Pharisees was hardly that of the cowardice he wished them to avoid.

As between Mk and Mt the latter is certainly truer to the almost invariable symbolism of "leaven" in Jewish parable. As Easton notes, "Leaven is the usual symbol for secret evil influence." Mt is therefore probably correct in his declaration that Jesus was warning against a "teaching" rather than against conspiracies, whether between "Pharisees and Herodians" or among "Pharisees and scribes." But the "teaching" of the Pharisees *and Sadducees*, by which we have seen that Mt describes the unbelief of Judaism as represented in its two leading sects, would be an extremely improbable source of temptation to the Twelve. Moreover for reasons already given we must hold to *Pharisaic* teaching alone as that against which the warning is directed.

It has also been shown that in the sense which Jesus attached to Pharisaism it might well become—in fact it did become—a very real and subtle temptation to his followers. They were but ill prepared to exercise that sovereign self-determination of conscience which he had exercised with all the authority of a prophet proclaiming "Thus saith Jehovah" against the conventions of priest or law-giver. One can easily imagine Jesus flinging out this challenging "Beware" on some such occasion as the attempt of Pharisees and "scribes from Jerusalem" to impose their artificial standards on his free conscience. But when did the occasion arise which brought his utterance to remembrance?

If the warning, Beware of the teaching of the Pharisees means what we have been constrained to think it means there is one occasion which so far transcends all others in importance and suggestiveness that no other can be considered in comparison with it. It is that cardinal crisis in the history of the apostolic Church which as Lk himself reports was brought forward by "certain of the sect of the Pharisees who believed," an intolerant reactionary group, denounced by Paul as "false brethren" who for a time seemed likely to impose their artificial and conventional rule of "clean and unclean" upon the Church to the destruction of its hopes of missionary conquest. After a prolonged struggle which came to the verge of disrupting the Church Paul was able to make good against these "Judaizers" his claim of absolute liberty from the conventions of Mosaism both for himself and his converts. But Pharisaism came very near to triumph in the circle of the apostles and elders in Jerusalem, a triumph which would certainly

have proved fatal to Christianity as a world-religion. Subtly and unconsciously James and John, yes, even Peter and Barnabas, were carried off their feet by this "hypocrisy" (for Paul does not hesitate to apply Jesus' own term of opprobrium to dependence in any degree by a subject of "the grace of the Lord Jesus" on Mosaic purity). Those who sympathized with Paul—and even James and Cephas and John sympathized with him to the extent of granting that heart-purity could be secured in the case of Gentiles "by faith" alone—must have realized that those of the sect of the Pharisees who had believed and nevertheless were seeking to impose their own impracticable yoke on the neck of Gentile believers were a "leaven" of the old order most perilous to the Church.

On a later occasion, when James and the elders were urging Paul to make a public demonstration that he himself set an example to "the Jews settled among the Gentiles" of "walking orderly keeping the Law" James points out to Paul that in Jerusalem "there are many myriads of the Jews that believe, and they are all zealots for the Law." In 54 A.D. that element of Pharisean leaven was at least large enough to give extreme uneasiness to Paul though fortunately not large enough in the end to "leaven the whole lump."

Our discussion has shown that the logion "Beware of the leaven of Pharisaism" is an erratic saying which our evangelists have difficulty both in locating and interpreting. Its authenticity is beyond question. Its original application and meaning are more doubtful. But when we ask concerning its transmission the problem seems less insoluble. It has been shown in the foregoing text that the Exile Section of Mk as well as the corresponding fourth Book of Mt are supremely concerned with the great problem of church unity engendered by the attempt to carry over into the new faith the Pharisaic distinctions of "clean" and "unclean." The logion finds various settings within the broad limits of this Book. The conclusion we venture to draw from a consideration of all the data is this: The circumstances which brought Jesus' saying to remembrance and perpetuated it by experience of its need and value was the disruptive effort of "certain of the Pharisees who had believed" to impose their dogma on the Church. These showed in their far-reaching subtle activity, creeping in privily to spy out the liberty of their Gentile brethren in order to bring them into bondage, how real a danger to the Church might be the tendency to revert to Pharisaism. Certainly the modern Church will be ill-advised if it disregards as obsolete the warning: "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees."

APPENDED NOTE X

ADDENDA

1. In our Preface the place of the present volume in a series of contributions, completed and projected, toward a Life of Christ was indicated as clearly as was possible four months ago. Since then new conditions have intervened. An invitation was accepted to deliver the inaugural series of Kent Shaffer Lectures on the Life of Christ at Yale Divinity School, and Henry Holt and Co. have added to the obligation the author feels for their courtesy by undertaking immediate publication of this further contribution under the title "Jesus the Son of God."

The Lectures necessarily take a place in the series of preliminary studies without pre-empting that of the culminating volume. Three chapters, headed respectively "What the Eye Saw," "What the Ear Heard," and "What Entered into the Heart of Man," aim to bring out a critical estimate of the three chief strands of gospel tradition, Markan, Mattheo-Lukan, and Johannine. Should opportunity not be given for the contemplated Life this preliminary sketch will serve to indicate the lines along which it might be expected to develop. A glimpse at plans on which the architect is still at work may serve a useful purpose even if the finished building shows altered forms.

2. Since the Ms. of these "Studies" left the author's hands several contributions have appeared of which he would gladly have availed himself. Schlatter's *Matthäus* came in time to be utilized in a few footnotes and some recasting of Appended Note VII. Other important works, including some long available, may have failed of adequate consideration through my own regrettable deficiencies. For this a charitable judgment is asked from contributors and readers alike.

3. An article published by R. Dunkerley of Gloucester, on the other hand, appearing in *HThR* for January, 1930 (XXIII, 1), under title "The Oxyrhynchus Fragments," approaches very closely the subject of Appended Note VI, bringing it into relation to the logia recently discovered among the papyri of Behneseh by Grenfell and Hunt. A few words seem, therefore, to be called for at this point to explain our dissent from some of Dunkerley's conclusions.

As a standard discussion of the nature, text, and literary relations of the Oxyrhynchus logia we may take *The Sayings of Jesus* by H. G. Evelyn-White (Cambridge, 1920), its conclusions having met general approval though controverted on some points by Vernon Bartlet

(*Expositor* XXIII, 1; February, 1922). Dunkerley had previously discussed the intricate problem of the uncanonical gospels in two able articles in *Expos. Times* (XXXIX, pp. 437–442 and 490–495). He now approves with most critics the judgment that most of the excerpts of the Oxyrhynchus logia, if not all, are drawn from *Ev. Hebr.*, though Evelyn-White, with many other critics including several who could avail themselves of Schmidtke's epoch-marking work, fail properly to distinguish this Ebionite Greek gospel, current in southern Syria and Egypt, from the Aramaic *Ev. Naz.*, orthodox in type, current in northern Syria and Mesopotamia.

The point of interest for ourselves is the question whether this Ebionite gospel known to Clement and Origen, from which the former makes an extract in substance identical with Oxyrh. Pap. No. 654, Log. II., may be identified with that to which Origen refers in his first *Homily on Lk* as "superscribed (ἐπιγεγραμμένον) *Gospel of the Twelve.*" In Appended Note VI (pp. 488 ff.) reasons were given for making this identification (against Schmidtke) with certain leading critics among whom Evelyn-White might properly have been included. Since Dunkerley regards the coincident extract as inconclusive, and finds objections on other grounds to regarding *Ev. Hebr.* as = *Ev. Eb.*, it becomes needful to examine these objections and observe whether the identification can still stand.

Objections 1–3 fall to the ground together with 4 (the coincident logion not demonstrative) when it is assumed, as in Appended Note VI, that the Ebionite "falsified and mutilated" Mt is really represented by the extracts given by Epiphanius (*Haer.* XXX. 13 f.), however we may find occasion to leave room for later development of this Ebionite literature. Epiphanius twice states (XXX. 13 and 14) that the "beginning" of this gospel (*Ev. Eb.*) was as follows:

> It came to pass in the days of Herod the king of Judea that John appeared practicing a baptism of repentance in the River Jordan. This man was said to be of the race of Aaron the priest, a son of Zacharias and Elizabeth, and all went forth unto him.

Epiphanius' second reference (XXX. 14) has the slight difference of reading that after "Herod the king of Judea" it adds "in the high-priesthood of Caiaphas" and for "John" reads "one John by name."

Epiphanius testifies explicitly that this writing, which abbreviated by "cutting out the genealogies of Mt" with much other material, and manifestly rested here and elsewhere much more on Lk than on Mt, was "called among them (the Ebionites) the Gospel according to Matthew." It was also called "The Hebrew (Gospel)," not because it was written in Aramaic (for as we know, Clement of Alexandria, though ignorant of Aramaic, twice quotes the *Ev. Hebr.*), but ap-

parently because of its currency as the "only" gospel recognized by this Jewish-christian sect (Irenaeus and Eusebius).

It was not until after it had related "many things" that the Ebionite gospel returned to the subject of the baptism of John, relating now more explicitly John's appearance, costume and diet, with slight (vegetarian) modifications of the Synoptic description, and proceeded to narrate the baptism of Jesus in a conflated form combining Mt with both the α and the β readings of Lk. The modification and the conflation easily prove the relatively late date (110–115?) and the Ebionite character of the writing; but we are not here concerned with these. We ask why *Ev. Eb.* should present *two* accounts of John's baptism separated by a long interval (πολλά) wherein one of the chief data appears to have been a parallel to the Synoptic account of the calling of the first disciples (Mk 1:16–20 plus 2:14 plus 3:13–19 and parallels); though the intervening story is not given in the form of narrative in the third person, but as an utterance of some person who is relating how Jesus recalled the facts to the memory of his disciples. They had been called to be "twelve apostles for witness to Israel." The speaker tells his hearers of this calling "at the Lake of Tiberias." The situation is that of I Cor. 15:5 (7?).

The explanation offered in Appended Note VI is that the speaker in this account of how Jesus called the twelve to be his witnesses to Israel is "James the Just," whose conversion had in the meantime been related in the form represented in the famous extract of Origen. James has now taken the part assumed by Peter in Acts 1–4 of "standing up with the eleven" to give their message as witnesses on behalf of Jesus. We may assume that the story ran somewhat as follows: James the Lord's brother, having heard at Nazareth of the catastrophe at Jerusalem vowed that he would not touch food till he should see the Lord risen from the dead (Origen). Jesus, accordingly, after delivering proof of his resurrection to the servant of the high priest, went to Nazareth and appeared to James instituting the resurrection feast in his family circle. Next, through the agency of James (not Peter) Jesus' disciples were rallied and brought to Jerusalem, where, under leadership of James, they bear their "witness to Israel."

This Ebionite method of rewriting the gospel story under the form of "new Acts of the Apostles" gave opportunity for restatement of every controverted saying and doing of the Lord in the form and sense maintained by the Jerusalem church as having the special authority of the Apostles. If we may draw analogies from the scenes depicted in the Petrinized (Catholic) version surviving in the *Clementina* James mounted the seven steps of the temple on successive days, refuted the seven heresies of Judaism and overwhelmed, as leader of

the Church, the futile arguments of Caiaphas the high priest in favor of the obsolete sacrificial system. Then the successive Apostles enumerated in Fragment 2 (Philip and Bartholomew appear to have been omitted from the "twelve" by accident) have their say, perhaps in pairs, as in the *Clementina*, beginning with "John" and ending with "Matthew" (*Ev. Eb.*). This gave opportunity to include all the "traditions of the elders" transmitted in oral form to Papias and by him in writing to Irenaeus. Thus "traditions of John" including (in variant form) the Pericope Adulterae and even utterances of "Judas Iscariot" meet us on both lines of transmission. "Matthew" is also singled out on both sides as "the publican" to act the part of scribe. There is thus a derivational connection between the *Ev. Hebr.* and the "traditions of the (Jerusalem) Elders" reported from Papias by Irenaeus.

If such was the structural scheme of the Ebionite gospel we can understand why it should be designated by those who acknowledged no other the "Gospel according to Matthew," while those who discerned its inferior and dependent character referred to it as "The Hebrew Gospel," or "The Gospel according to the Hebrews," or (from its most salient characteristic) "The Gospel of (or according to) the Twelve (*Ev. XII*)." In fact Jerome himself explicitly states (*contra Pelag.* iii. 2) that *Secundum Apostolos* was one of the titles applied to his (falsified) *Ev. Hebr.* At the same time it will be equally apparent why a series of extracts made from it by an excerptor, desirous for any reason of making an anthology of the life-giving words of Jesus, could not, even if his excerpts were set down in just the order of the original, give any intelligible sequence of ideas. The original only reported that "John" related this, "Andrew" that, "Philip" the other (Papias). Reasons for the order would be irrecoverable. Dunkerley's objection 1 thus disappears.

Again the objection that *Ev. Hebr.* had but 2,200 lines against 2,500 in Mt (Nicephorus) loses all force on our assumption. By 375, when Epiphanius wrote, there had of course been large development on the original stock of the "new Acts of the Apostles." The Leucian Acts are only one example. But when Hegesippus resorted to *Ev. Hebr.* for his traditions of "James the Just" a work of 2,200 lines might well suffice for the purpose in view. On pp. 481, 488, and 490 above it has been pointed out that no more space would be needed; the extracts already given show how drastically the Ebionite evangelist could condense and omit when it did not serve his purpose to conflate and expand.

The Lucan coloration of *Ev. Eb.* is also objected and is indeed very conspicuous; in some of Epiphanius' extracts Lukan material decidedly predominates. But the same is true of the Pericope Adul-

terae, which Eusebius found in the *Ev. Hebr.*, and which the Ferrariani attach to Lk 21:38. Thus, on the basis assumed in Appended Note VI, Dunkerley's objections 1–4 present no obstacle whatever to the identification of *Ev. Hebr.* with *Ev. Eb.* The further identification of both with the *Gospel of the Twelve* (*Ev. XII*) is brought to a very high degree of probability in the three scholarly articles of H. Waitz in the *ZNW* for 1912–13 (XIII, pp. 338 ff. and XIV, pp. 38 ff. and 117 ff.) on "Das Evangelium der zwölf Apostel." The peculiarity of Waitz's argument is that while he identifies *Ev. Eb.* with *Ev. XII*, and was even at first disposed to identify this with the source employed by Hegesippus called "*Ev. Hebr.*" by Eusebius, he ultimately (art. III, p. 122 f.) took the ground that *this Ev. Hebr.* was a different writing from the *Ev. Hebr.* of Clement and Origen.

The subject is too complex for our present limits, but seeing ourselves committed to an attempted solution in spite of the prudent warning of Streeter that the adventure is "daring," we may take the present occasion for meeting the latest objections based on the Oxyrhynchus logia, objections which Dunkerley formulates after the four already met in the following language:

> (5) Surely such a work as he (Evelyn-White) posits would imply in its title what it was; whereas the prologue here—however reconstructed—provides a different opening altogether.
>
> (6) Further, if, as appears almost certain, there is any kind of mention in the prologue of the Ten and Thomas (in reference presumably to Jn 20:26), or of any other disciple and Thomas, or of Thomas alone, surely the identification with the Gospel according to the *Twelve* must fall to the ground.
>
> (7) He (Evelyn-White) objects that the reference to Jn 20:26 cannot be intended to suggest the occasion of the teaching; but his argument is not convincing. "Who would represent the disciples as asking for instruction," he says, "as to prayer, fasting and the like in the period between the Resurrection and the Ascension?" One may answer by asking, Why not? It appears to me quite a possible setting for such a conversation.
>
> (8) He therefore regards this reference as merely the citation of proof that he who uttered these sayings was the living Lord. Surely this would be a most awkward and unusual introduction to such a book.
>
> (9) There is more to be said than Evelyn-White allows for the gospel character (in distinction from that of a collection of sayings) at least of O(xyrhynchus) P(apyrus) 654.

These five additional objections to Evelyn-White's identification of the source of the Oxyrhynchus logia with *Ev. Hebr.*, and this uncanonical gospel itself with *Ev. XII*, are all concerned with the so-called "prologue," the beginning of Papyrus 654 which in Evelyn-White's restoration reads as follows:

> These are the life-giving Sayings which Jesus spake who liveth and was seen of the Ten and of Thomas. And he said to them: Whosoever heareth these Sayings shall not taste of death.

Dunkerley's contention (6) is that the "prologue" (which he admits presents the succeeding list of excerpts as logia addressed to the group described in Jn 20:26) implies a group of something other than *Twelve* as authorities for the logia, whereas the *Ev. XII* presented the Twelve (including Iscariot, or perhaps taking James the Just as surrogate for Judas) as the "witnesses."

This and the four associated objections derive such force as they have from an assumption which is indeed made by Evelyn-White, but which is to our judgment both needless and improbable; viz., that "the prologue" fits exactly to the group of excerpts which it introduces. In reality, while the assumed occasion is a favorite among the composers of agrapha (*e.g.*, *Apoc. Petri*) the logia themselves are neither post-resurrectional in character (*pace* Dunkerley) nor "homogeneous" (*pace* Evelyn-White). They consist of material of Synoptic type, showing no connection (as does the "prologue") with Jn, but apparently owing their collection to the fact that they are either supplementary to Synoptic tradition, or, where closely parallel, show divergences suggesting a different occasion or application. The alleged "homogeneity" is either non-existent, or can only be defended by precarious suppositions such as those of Vernon-Bartlet, who himself acknowledges a "two-fold character of the collection" as "partly historical, partly timeless or mystical." Saying V (Pap. 654) is a parallel to the teaching on Almsgiving, Fasting, and Prayer of Mt 6:1–18; Saying VIII is a plaint of Wisdom, quite possibly pre-Christian like Bar. 3:9–37. We must put together the mystical *Gospel according to the Egyptians* and the Synoptic-typed *Ev. Hebr.* to discover any "homogeneity," and even then we shall be hard put to it to discover a more definite motive for the collection than the desire to supplement the canonical Gospels.

We may therefore leave quite open the question whether Pap. 1 (the so-called Oxyrhynchus Logia) as well as Pap. 654, or only the latter was meant for public circulation. At least the key to both collections and their motive is furnished by the "prologue." But the "prologue" is not only in the nature of the case later than the excerpts, it also constructs a false setting for them. Moreover one cannot well imagine an excerptor making an anthology of "life-giving words" from a *single* uncanonical source, especially if himself employing the fourth Gospel. Two methods would be open to him for perpetuating the supplementary material of *Ev. Hebr.* if he specially valued it. He could (a) copy the work, which remained current in Egypt long after his time; or (b) collate it with his canonical Gospels as the Zion Mss.

collate the readings of *Ev. Naz.* with canonical Mt. Our collector has chosen neither course. His work is much more akin to modern collections of agrapha.

Still more indicative of collection from more than one source is the fact that the collector has not been able to avoid a certain amount of overlapping. Saying V (Pap. 654, 5) gives one answer to the question how the Jewish religious observances are to be perpetuated, viz., by private devotion. Saying VII (Pap. 1, Log. II) gives a different answer, viz., Fasting and Sabbath-keeping must be universalized; abstinence must have "the world" as its object, sabbath rejoicing must sanctify the whole week. We conclude that the collector did not limit himself to a single source but aimed to gather material supplementary to the canonical from at least the two chief uncanonical gospels current among Egyptian believers.

If, then, the "prologue" is no more than an editor's improvised framework for his collection of miscellaneous excerpts we surely could not expect a closer approximation to the transmitting group who in *Ev. XII* = *Ev. Hebr.* = *Ev. Eb.* appear as Jesus' "witnesses to Israel" than "the Ten and Thomas" who in Jn 20:26 are similarly commissioned by the living Lord. *Ev. XII* either thought of the original twelve as thus commissioned, or possibly counted James the Just as surrogate for Iscariot. Either way a post-resurrection occasion (and Dunkerley is probably right in thinking this to be implied in the "prologue") would require the group of Jn 20:26, where the commissioned witnesses are in fact "the ten and Thomas."

With the recognition of the editorial character of "the prologue" no more remains of objections 5–9 raised by Dunkerley to the identification of *Ev. Hebr.* with *Ev. XII* than of objections 1–4. Whether in addition *Ev. Eb.* may be regarded as another designation for the same variously called apokryphon must be determined after due consideration especially of the arguments of Schmidtke and Waitz. In any event the factitious importance attached to the title *Ev. Hebr.* must disappear with the recognition that it is almost wholly due to the illusion of Apollinaris of Laodicea and the unscrupulous vanity of Jerome. *Ev. Hebr.* was probably the first writing to claim authorship by "Matthew." In content it really offered only a dependent and sectarian blend of our own first and third canonical Gospels. It had no real claim to rank with the anonymous North Syrian Gospel from which it borrowed most of its material, reluctantly surrendering in return its fanciful title "According to Matthew."

4. Most recently of all has come a valuable work by B. H. Branscomb under the title *Jesus and the Law of Moses* (R. R. Smith, New York, 1930). This obviously parallels our Theme I of Part IV (pp. 339–360), giving fuller treatment from a kindred viewpoint.

5. Reference has been made above, on pp. 134, 165 and 174n, to "Appended Note X." As regards 134 and 165 Mt's use of δικαιοσύνη corresponds to the observation of W. Robertson Smith in his *Prophets of Israel* (1882), p. 71 f., "Righteousness is to the Hebrew not so much a moral quality as a legal status."

As regards 174n we may add a reference to the *Excerpta e Theodoto* (74), where the purpose of the Lord's coming is declared to have been "to make peace, even that which comes from heaven to those on earth."

INDEX I

Patristic References

Abercius, 14, 499
Addai, *Doctrine of*, 16
Africanus, 53
Al-Biruni, 157
Ammonius, 49 n.
Andreas of Caesarea, 117, 454
Apollinaris of Hierapolis, 56 f., 258, 441 464
——— Laodicea, 162, 478, 480 f.
Aristeas (Pseudo-), 203 f., 352
Ascents of James, 489 f.
Assumptio Mosis, 204, 379, 485 n.
Augustine, 13, 63

Bardesanes, 16
Barnabas (Pseudo-), 25, 76, 352, 443
Basilides, 3, 31, 42

Canticles Rabba, 368 n.
Celsus, 73
Cerinthus, 58, 149, 457
Chrysostom, 48
Clement (Alexandrinus), 56, 64, 205, 380 n., 483
——— (Romanus), 73, 78, 203 n., 229 n., 233, 247, 366, 476
Clementina, 91, 205, 225 n., 256, 352, 380 n., 489, 493 f.
Consularia Constantinopolitana, 51 f.

Diatessaron, 16, 43, 507
Didaché, 25, 31 f., 201, 226, 350, 361, 366, 409, 513

Enoch (*Eth.*), 414 n.
——— (*Slav.*), 380
Epiphanius, 14, 43–50, 52, 163, 480, 485–494
Eusebius
Chronicle, 441
History, 16, 20, 33, 42, 53, 78 f., 441, 457, 486
Preparatio, 154
Theophany, 478, 481

Ev. Duod. (*XII*), 44, 481, 488
——— *Eb.*, 41, 44, 46, 481, 492–495
——— *Hebr.*, 18 f., 43, 59, 110, 171, 241–252, 479 f., 486 f., 493 f.
——— *Naz.*, xv, 17, 89, 161, 171 n., 234, 248 n., 258 f., 390, 406, 478–480, 507
——— *Petri* (See "Peter, Ps.")

Faustus, 28

Genesis Rabba, 174 n.
Gospel acc. to Egyptians, 19 n., 28, 45
——— *Judas-Thomas*, 46
——— *Ebionites, Hebrews, The Twelve*, etc. (See *Ev.*, *Eb.*, *Hebr.*, *XII*, etc.)

Hegesippus, 14, 79, 482–484
Hippolytus, 53, 463

Ignatius, 4, 20, 25, 30 f., 54, 153, 171, 259
Irenaeus, xv, 42, 45, 48, 63, 457, 463, 465, 493

Jerome, xii, 14, 89 n., 162, 220 n., 471, 479 ff.
Johanan b. Zacchai, 71 f.
John (Pseudo), *Acts of*, 494
Josephus, 14, 17, 226, 402
Judas Thomas, Gospel of, 494
Justin Martyr, 42 f., 440, 444, 454

Lucian, 15, 498

Melito, xv f.
Muratorianum, 48, 54 f., 59, 463 f.

Origen, 29, 31, 39, 55 n., 74, 89, 468, 471, 480 f., 483, 488
Oxyrhynchus Papyri, 91, 125, 175, 235, 443

Pantaenus, 20 f.
Papias, x, 3 ff., 27, 48 f., 55, 256, 362 n., 439–442, 445–451, 487, 493 f.

Paschal Chronicle, 50, 464
Peter (Pseudo)
  Apocalypse, 146, 486
  Doctrine, 31
  Gospel, 19, 22, 29 n., 44, 251 f., 256
  Preaching, 199
Philastrius, 462
Philo, 202, 442
Pirke Aboth, 107, 125, 131, 189, 204, 235, 379
Pliny, 14
Plutarch, 151
Polycarp, Epistle of, 25 n., 76, 444, 465
Prologues
  Anti-Marcionite, 33, 452–466
  of Melito (?), xiv f.
  Monarchian, xv, 33
Quadratus, 441 f.

Sanhedrin, 205
Sayings of the Fathers (See "*Pirke Aboth*")
Sefer Hayyashar, 153
Shemoneh Esreh, 431–433

Tatian, 16, 43, 49 n.
Teaching of Twelve (See "*Didaché*")
Tertullian, 55, 456–460
Test. of XII Patr.
  Levi, 175, 259
Theodore of Mopsuestia, 155
Theodoret, 43
Theodotion, 205

Yalkut, 156

INDEX II

SUBJECTS AND AUTHORS

(Authors' names in small capitals)

Abbreviations, viii n., xxiv
——— of Mt., 87, 138
Abgar of Edessa, 15
Acts (First), 224 ff., 352, 401
——— vs. Mt, 15–18, 224–226
Adiabene, 15, 226, 352, 498
Administration, 231–233, 406
Adoptionism, 149 f.
Agapé, 221 n., 222 f.
ALLEN, 10, 87 f., 96 f., 122, 135 f., 470 f., 499
Alogi, 53
Am-haaretz, 227, 341 f.
Anonymity of Mt, 32
Antioch, 15, 19 f., 22 f., 24, 31–33, 365 f.
Anti-Pharisaism, 124, 346
Antitheses of Higher Ethic, 123, 177 f., 347, 474, 508
Apocalypse (Synoptic), 67, 74, 467–469
Apocalypticism, 415–418
Apostasy (The Great), 69, 74, 467
Apostolate, 361–374
Apostolic Conclave, 224
——— Council, 34, 224–226
——— Mission, 196–201
Appearances (Resurrection), 114, 254 f.
Arabia, 15
Aramaic documents, xi, 21, 25, 34 (See also *Ev. Naz.*)
——— language, 157, 497
Aristion, 3

BACON, B. W., viii–xi, 3 n., 4 n., 6, 37, 50, 67, 82, 85 n., 86, 105, 112, 118, 122, 167, 170, 174 n., 191, 203, 212, 218, 221 f., 228 n., 230 f., 377, 445, 467, 486
Baptizers (Sabeans=Mazbotheans), 157
Bartholomew (Apostle), 20
BARTLET (Vernon), 94, 106 f., 115, 439
Beatitudes, 147 f., 179
BERGMANN, 204
Beth-Alpha mosaic, 154
Birth (See Nativity)
BLASS, 486 n.
Blindness and Deafness (spiritual), 210 f., 240, 376, 381–387
Books of Mt, 82
BOX, G. H., 153
BRUYNE DE, 452–466
BÜCHLER, 402 n.
BURKITT, 16, 92, 95, 98, 100, 101 n., 164, 500

Caesarea (Philippi), 230, 236, 239, 398, 431
——— (Stratonis=Palestina), 497
Call (of Apostles), 44
——— of Matthew, 193
——— of Jesus (See Baptism and Vocation)
Canaanite (Syrophoenician) woman, 18, 219, 398, 409
CASE, S. J., 187 n.
CHEYNE, T. K., 154
Chiliasts, 55, 75
Christ (See Discourses, Incidents, Sayings)
  Life of, vii–x, 525
  Titles of, 379, 394, 415 f., 425
    Servant, 204
    Son of David, 425
    ——— God, 145 ff.
    ——— Man, 349
  Baptism and Vocation, 214, 393
Christology, 146, 248
Clean and unclean (Law of), 219–221, 350, 401, 409, 515
CLEMEN, C., 154, 453
Come-outers, 164 ff., 185, 341 f. (See also *Am-haaretz*)
Cornelius, 224
Covenant (Farewell) Supper, 115 117 f., 260, 421

DALMAN, 7 n.
Day of Judgment (See Judgment Day)

DeBruyne [See *Bruyne (de)*]
Dieterich, 130
Discourses (individual)
  Abiding Wealth, 108, 182 f., 347
  Administration, 218–230, 230–235
  Apostleship, 196–201, 361–374
  Consummation, 236–244, 244–249
  Doom-chapter, 67 f., 245
  Filial Righteousness, 81, 168 f., 172 ff., 178 f., 340–346, 513
  Prayer, 108, 123, 347
  Revelation to Elect, 204–215, 215–217
  Reward, 509
  Right Religion, 122
  Righteousness, 165–169, 172–186, 340 ff.
  Woes on Scribes and Pharisees, 161, 246 f., 427
  ——— Impenitent Cities, 208
Dispersion of Apostles, 6, 63 n.
Dissemination foci, 19, 31
Divorce, 239, 349, 353
Dobschütz, v., 32, 47 n., 71, 131 f.
Doom-chapter, 67 ff., 245 (See also Jerusalem, Fall of)

Ebionites (sect), 42 f., 45
Ebionite gospel (See *Ev. Eb.*)
Edessa of Osrhoene, 15, 36, 51, 164 n., 499
Egypt, 19
Election (The), 202–205, 383–387
Epilogue (The), 113, 250–261
Epiphany, 58, 146–150
Eschatology, 426–435
——— of Apostolic Fathers, 434
——— S, 368
Ethic of Jesus, 339–360
Exile section, 219–221, 398 f., 409

Faith, 86, 190 ff., 361, 374, 388
——— Wonders (See Miracle)
False prophets, 64, 69, 73 f., 77, 86, 125, 149, 175, 183–185, 468
Farewell Supper (See Covenant Supper)
Fasts and Fasting, 361
Feine, 106
Fiebig, 72
Filial Righteousness (See Discourse on)
Food laws, 224–228, 381, 408
Forgiveness of sins, 189–191, 391–393
——— brethren, 129, 406
Formulas (of Mt), 81, 138
Four-document theory, 505–510

Gnostics and Gnosticism, 45, 149, 488
  Antinomian, 47, 348
  Samaritan, 74, 468 f.
Godet, 38
Grace (See Reward)

Haggada and *Halacha*, 95 f., 502
Harnack, von, 65, 92–95, 115, 176, 439, 452 ff., 473, 488
Harris, R., xv, 449, 500
Hawkins, 92–98, 107, 123, 138–142, 188, 451
Hellenization, 22, 47, 76, 407, 428, 481
Herod Agrippa, 6, 228, 424, 511 f.
——— Antipas, 503, 511 f.
Hiding of the Mystery (See Mystery)
Hilgenfeld, 52, 445, 488

Illusions of critics, xi ff.
Incidents of gospel story
  Anointing in Bethany, 110 f., 399
  Arrest in Gethsemane, 258
  Baptism and Vocation, 115
  Coin in fish's mouth (See Stater)
  Debates in temple, 243
  Divorce, Question about, 353–356
  Fig tree withered, 243
  Mary and Martha, 113
  Passion, 252 f.
  Penitent Harlot, 110 f.
  ——— Thief, 112
  Rejection at Nazareth, 116, 399 n.
  Request of Zebedaeidae, 503
  Rich Enquirer, 88, 503
  Widow's Son, 111
  Zacchaeus, 112
Inwardness in Worship, 121

James the Just, 225 f., 254–256, 352, 401, 408, 484 f., 490, 492 f., 517
——— son of Alphaeus, 39 f.
——— Epistle of, 74 f.
Jerusalem
  Coming, 421 f.
  Decrees, 403, 408 f.
  Doom and Fall, 66 ff., 364
  Plaint over, 248
  Seat of Church, 198, 365
  Tradition of, 256
Jn, Gospel of, x
  Eschatology, 413 f., 428 f.

Order, 5
Son of Man section, 358 f.
———, Revelation of, 4, 55, 73, 427, 454
Johanan b. Zacchai, 71, 131, 174
John (Apostle), 4, 457, 485, 487, 490–493, 517
———Baptist, 102, 193
———, Disciples of, 207
——— The Elder, 3, 7, 13, 26, 28, 439 f.
Judas Iscariot, 258, 493, 504
Judgment (messianic), 412–435
——— Day of, 75, 97, 344, 430

Kingdom of heaven (God), 167, 341
——— heaven, heirs of, 168, 231 n.
——— David, 421 f., 432

L (source), 106 ff., 241, 257, 359, 505 (See also Lk)
Stories of Women in, 110, 112 n.
Story parables in, 109
Law, Jesus and, 168, 348 ff.
——— vs. Grace, 356 (See also Mk, Section on)
Leaven (parable) (See Parables)
——— of Pharisees, 511–517
Leaving all, 238
Levi vs. Matthew, 39 f., 59, 166
Life of Christ, approach to, vii–x
Lightfoot, 439, 445, 453, 455
Lk-Acts
Date, 70
Method, 80, 108
Omissions, 110 f., 124, 399
Order of, 105, 210 f.
Perean section, 237
Provenance, 32 f.
Sources, 106, 111
Story parables of, 109
Woes on scribes and Pharisees, 515
Loaves, Miracle of, 220–227
Logia (the term), 443–451
——— (individual) (See Sayings)
Loisy, xii, 108
Lord's Prayer, 141

M (alleged factor) (See Proto-Mt)
Magi and Star, 51, 58, 153
Magians, 33, 151 f., 156 f.
Mandeans, 21, 157
Marcion, xvi, 4 n., 31, 48, 440, 450–466
Mark (Evangelist), vii
Martyrdom, 198, 239, 369
Marriott, 122
Matthew (Apostle), vii n., 4, 6, 10 f., 26 f., 45
Title, 41–45
McNeile, 11, 17, 64, 172 f., 176 f., 181, 196, 258
Micklem, 12, 83–85
Miracles, 187–196, 362, 369–374
——— (individual), Eutychus, 371
of Loaves, 400, Red Sea, 372
of healing, 86, 190, 362, 391
of authority, 190 f.
of exorcism, 110
Mission (Sending) of Twelve, 77, 129, 196 f.
Mk (Gospel)
Endings, 251 ff.
Priority, 9 ff., Proto-Mk, 7, Purpose, 166
Use of S, 168
Section on Call of Fishermen, 170
——— Exile, 219–221, 237, 398
——— Jerusalem, 67 f., 245
——— Law vs. Grace, 127 f., 239, 348–351, 356
——— Opposition, 383
——— Perean Journey, 238 f.
Moffatt, J., 8, 92, 264
Moore, G. F., 133 f.
Mt (Gospel) vs. Lk, 113
Abbreviations, 85
Anti-Judaism, xvi
Apocalyptic trend, 413
Canonization, 50–61
Conditions of time, 20, 75
Date, 63, 79, 199
Dissemination, 20
Factors (Q, N, etc.), 506 f.
Formulas, 138
Language, 134 f., 158 f., 496–504
Neo-legalism, 88
Omissions, 85, 105–119
Phraseology, 132 f., 139–142
Preamble, 145–164
Priority, xiii, 7, 10 ff.
Provenance, 11, 19
Redactional Freedom, 97
——— traits, 131–142
Scripture quotations, 11, 136, 157
Sondergut (P), 120–130, 140
Structure, xiv, 81–85, 161, 170
Supplements, 129, 155
Ten Mighty Works, 110, 170

Title, 19, 27 ff., 37
Use of Mk, 80–90
Mystery, Hiding of the, 204 f., 375–389

N (factor) xii, 12, 17, 145–164, 499–504, 507
Nativity, 130, 148 f.
Date of, 53
Disputes on, 59, 114
Ignatius on, 30
Legends of, 152–154
Nazarenes (sect), 17, 21, 43, 154, 157, 161–164, 220 n., 478 ff.
Neo-legalism, 47
Nestle, 152 f.
New Torah section, 176–183, 342, 509
(See also Antitheses)
Norden, 123, 151–203
Nork, 121 n.

Oral tradition, xiii, 72, 98 f., 129, 507
Order of material, gnomic vs. biographic, 98, 102
in Jn, 5
in Lk, 105
in Mk, 5, 7, 188 f.
in Mt, 49, 80–86
in S., 101
——— in Four-gospel canon, 48

Parables, 94 f., 126, 208–217
——— (classes)
of Judgment, 97, 126, 130, 426 f.
of P^{mt}, 20
of Watchfulness, 246, 249
Story parables, 99, 109, 127, 130
Vineyard parables, 116, 243
——— (individual)
Builders on Sand, 343
Closing Door, 126, 184
Dissatisfied Wage-earners, 127
Entrusted Funds, 94 f.
Good Samaritan, 359
Importunate Friend, 108
——— Widow, 109
Leaven and Mustard Seed, 210, 215
Lost Sheep, 234
Patient Husbandman, 85, 97
Prodigal Son, 112, 128, 243
Slighted Invitation, 65 f., 94 f.
Sower, 208 f.
Strong Man Spoiled, 214
Treasure and Pearl, 121, 129, 216
Unforgiving Servant, 128, 407
Usurping Husbandmen, 243, 246
Wedding Garment, 72
Paschal controversy, 56, 465
Passion narratives
in Mt, 114
in S., 115 f.
Perean ministry, 237, 400
Pericope Adulterae, 86, 112, 486 f., 491
Persecution, 77, 198 f., 200, 368, 469
Peter (Apostle), viii, 7, 224, 229 f., 352 f., 401–403, 447, 517
Authority to bind and loose, 410
Appearance to, 253
Confession of Christ, 404
Rebuked by Paul, 403
Petrine Supplements, 222–230, 500, 503
Pfleiderer, 70
Pharisees, 512–517
Philip (Evangelist), 3, 36, 106
Plummer, 28 f.
Polycarp (bishop), 56 f.
Preamble (of Mt), 113, 145–164
Preaching (missionary), 145, 166 f.
Priority (of Mt), 7–10
——— (of Mk), 192 ff.
Proto-Lk, 106 f., 505
Proto-Mt, xiii, 173
Soltau's, 157–160
Streeter's (M), 122, 173, 505 f.
Purity (ritual) (See Clean and Unclean)

Q and S distinguished, vi–xiii
Extent of, 91–104, 124 ff.
Order of, 99–102
Reconstructions, 93
Scripture quotations, 137, 470–477
Use in Mt's Book III, 205–215
Quartodecimanism, 56, 465
Quietus, 16
Quotations (Scripture)
in Mt, 126, 135 f., 157
in N. (Reflection citations), 137, 159 f., 195
in S., 137, 470–477

Repentance (the Great), 376, 392
Resurrection (See Appearances)
Reward, 238, 349, 356, 509
Rich Enquirer, 88, 503
in *Ev. Naz.*, 89
Robertson, J. M., 12 n.

Robinson, J. A., 129 n.
Rome, 33, 35, 57, 229
  Church practice at, 409
  Council of, 120 A.D., 42, 51–60

S. (source)
  Distinguished from Q, xiii
  Arrangement in Mt, 206–215
  Christology, 395 ff.
  Contents, 105, 115–119, 177 f., 205 ff., 400
  Origin, 36 ff., 383 f.
  Passion story, 117 f., 126, 257
  Scripture quotations, 470–477
Sabbath conflicts, 215 f., 350
Sanday, 83
Sayings vs. discourses, 91 f., 107 f., 250
——— (individual)
  Celibacy (eunuchs), 124, 241
  Effect of Baptist, 94, 102
  Forgiveness, 126
  Little ones, 253, 405
  Savorless Salt, 103
  Spiritual Kin, 166
  Thrones of Judgment, 94, 115–126
Schechter, S., 153
Schlatter, 7 n., 9 n., 439, 496–504
Schleiermacher, xii, 444
Schmidtke, 471, 479 ff.
Schmiedel, 447
Sending (See Mission)
Sepulchre stories, 259
Serapion, 16, 44
Sermon on Mount (See Discourses)
Soden v., 70 f., 363 n.
Solomon (of Ecclesiastes), 108
——— (model of wisdom), 395
Soltau, 130, 135, 157–160, 470 ff., 500
Spirit, The, 197, 213, 255, 388–394
Spiritual Kin, 167, 169, 206 f.
Stanton, 9, 33, 40–45, 176, 341, 450
Stater (coin), 36, 156, 228
Streeter, 10, 18 f., 31–33, 36, 52, 97, 99, 111, 122, 155, 173, 502, 505 ff.
Stumbling vs. Receiving, 124, 230–233, 405, 411
Supper of Farewell (See Covenant Supper)
Symbols, marginal, 264
Synoptic problem, ix, 8 f., 505
Syriac synchronisms, 50 f.
Syrophoenician woman (See Canaanite)

Targums and targuming, 13 f., 21–23, 27, 153, 501
Tatian, 16
Taylor, V., 116
Temple
  Debates in, 243
  Forsaken, 248
  Profanation, 77
  Purging, 244
  Tax, 228
  Triumphal entry into, 242
Temptations, 160, 170, 345
Testimonia, xv, 160, 449, 500
Thanksgiving for Revelation, 396
Thaumaturgy, 374
Toleration, 233, 404 f.
Transfiguration, 146, 404
Tribulation (The Great), 68, 77, 245, 368, 468 f.

Unity (of Church), 231 f., 397–411

Vernon-Bartlet (See Bartlet)
Virgin birth (See Nativity)
Vocation (See Christ, Baptism and Vocation)
Volz, P., 151

Wedding garment (See Parables)
Weiss, B., 106–108, 115, 117, 128, 506
Wellhausen, 101, 106
Wernle, 41, 92, 95, 115, 133, 157, 160
Widow's Mites, 85 f., 244, 487
——— Son, 109–111
Windisch, 389
Wisdom logia, 123, 203, 247, 377, 395 f.
  Children of, 209
  Invitation of, 123, 212
  Spirit of, 383 f.
Woman (adulterous) (See *Pericope Adulterae*)
Women, stories of, 110–112
Woes (See Discourses)
Word-counting method, 93–99

Zahn, 7, 9 f., 12 f., 17, 25–27, 39 ff., 51, 217, 498
Zealots, 422 f.

Date Due

DEC 5 1975
12-20
AUG 2 9 1977
NOV 1 6 1977
MAY 1 3 1978
OCT 9 1978
OCT 2 7 1980
DEC 1 3 1984
DEC 2 0 1985
JAN 3 1986
MAR 1 3 1991
DE 0 2 '96

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

226.2011
B128

Bacon, Benjamin Wisner
AUTHOR
Studies in Matthew.
TITLE
16556

226.2011
B128 Bacon, Benjamin Wisner
Studies in Matthew.

16556